

C  
MAY 16 1914

---

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

---

75 cents per copy

---

THE  
**LUTHERAN QUARTERLY**

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLIV—NO. 2.

---

APRIL, 1914.

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1914

# CONTENTS

I. THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE CHURCH.....	157
BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUBLIN, D.D.	
II. PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY. ....	187
BY PROFESSOR HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.	
III. WHY MUST WE HOLD FAST TO THE CONFESSION? .....	195
BY PROFESSOR THEODORE ZAHN.	
IV. THE GENERAL SYNOD AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL IN HISTORY. ....	213
BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT.	
V. THE FUNCTION OF THE MINISTER IN DIVINE WORSHIP. ....	227
BY REV. HARRY D. NEWCOMER.	
VI. SOCIALISM—A MENACE TO THE HOME, CHURCH AND STATE. ....	237
BY REV. RALPH H. BEGGSTRESSER.	
VII. CHRISTIANITY AND THE MODERN MIND. ....	244
BY REV. B. LEDERER.	
VIII. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT. ....	256
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL BOSE WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
IX. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE. ....	283
The Reformation in Germany—Liberia—Theological Symbols—Election and Conversion—The Augsburg Confession—Christian Baptism—India, Malaysia and the Philippines—Faith and Duty—Our Spiritual Skies—The Sovereign People—The Diary of a Minister's Wife—The Renaissance of Faith—The Pulpit and the Pew.	

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1914.

---

## ARTICLE 1.

### THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE CHURCH.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

In an age such as ours men are needing continually to be called back to the contemplation of the fact, that the greatest interest on this earth at this or any other time, is the kingdom of God. It is the final goal of all history, the inner truth and moving spirit of all society. In it are lodged the secret of better humanity, and when it adheres to its own distinctive sphere of influence, in it are found and strengthened all the factors that insure a real evolution toward something that is better in social organization. But our age is so diversely and intensely practical that many have little patience with anything that does not appeal to them as being suffused with the same spirit. The rapid advance of natural science for a generation or two past, has done much to give us this standpoint. Keen and fine intellects, with big attainments, have been directed to scientific investigations. The world has been dazzled by the wonderful discoveries which have enabled us to understand and use material forces. Science, in the estimation of many, has taken the place which was formerly held by philosophy. It may be that, under the dominance of such conditions, it is natural that our ideals of life should have become materialistic and our view of the essentials of life somewhat disproportionate. Along with this advance of science there has come in too, and as a consequence of it, an

advance of industry in the application of the forces of nature. In the estimate of many machinery is more important in the modern conditions of manufacture than the labor which stands over and directs the machinery. Business capacity ranks higher than it ever has in the past. Everything seems to be rated at marketable values, even a quantity of brain can be classified according to the wages it can demand. A material invention for saving labor is of much more moment than any amount of abstract thought. We are, it looks to many a thoughtful man, who is concerned about the higher utilities, rapidly becoming slaves to what is alleged to be the practical.

The problem proposed to the generation preceding our own was intellectual rather than vital, for it was simply this, how to reconcile religion and science. New facts and new hypotheses about the order of nature threatened as it seemed, for a time, to bring on a conflict between the facts and hypotheses and the established truths of revelation. In their haste to precipitate the conflict some of the less informed among the *savants* of science hastened to fling mediaeval nicknames at the theologians. But that phase of thought in the century preceding this soon settled itself for the representatives of the thinking capacity of the Church speedily accorded a generous hospitality to every really authenticated fact of science whether it was a fact pertaining to the infinite spaces of astronomy or the infinitesimal molecules of biological science. The natural and the spiritual soon composed their real differences, the dogmatic and the sceptical soon were traveling toward a harmonious adjustment.

But at the opening years of the new century the most widely exploited theories are those which pertain to the adjustment of religion to the strained and complex conditions of the modern world. If natural science claimed the chief place in the decades immediately preceding, certainly the privilege in our day has been usurped by the more vital and humane science of sociology. It is indeed curious to note the shifting of positions during the thirty years that are past. Political economy has reasserted itself and become the science propitious and prophetic of better things said to be coming. The scientist has receded as the sociologist claims to have come to the kingdom and at the right time, as he estimates values, and when he was most needed. Men are now coming to be more concerned about social wrongs and reorganiza-



tion than about the missing link, about the vital values of mankind than about the origin of mankind. Questions pertaining to the family, philanthropy, industrial life, the racial divisions and collisions which have grown out of the relations of men to each other are persistently pressed upon public attention. Prof. Hein has said that as the fifteenth century had for its task the renaissance of art, and the sixteenth century the reformation of religion, and the seventeenth century the development of science and the eighteenth century the promotion of democracy, so the task of the twentieth century is to be the reformation and reconstruction of the social world. "A new renaissance," says he, "must break upon the modern world, a deliverance from the gloom of pessimism, which is the symptom of a weary and overworked period; a transformation of the instincts of social evolution into rational laws; a quickening of the glad and confident service of the social world as it is and as it is to be."

It may be recalled that the distinguished scientist, Wm. Alfred Russell Wallace, but lately deceased, and who once disputed the honor of the announcement of Darwinism with even Darwin himself, turned aside from his cherished scientific pursuits to write a book about land nationalization. Spencer's *Biology* has been supplanted largely by Spencer's *Sociology*. The more vital conflict between capital and labor now engrosses vastly more attention than the once famous conflict alleged to be going on between Genesis and Geology. The social question, it is declared, has now become a religious question and makes its appeal to all the sacred motives that connect themselves with the Redeemer of mankind and the culture of His cross. Regarding the Gospel there are various shades of belief among us and we accord to all the right to private judgment. There are people who still believe that it is most important of all that we have a Christianity to apply, while there are others who seem to be entirely interested in discussing the applications of Christianity. There are those who believe that the duty of getting men to share God's redemptive purpose does not impose upon the Church the task of adopting definite programs of social reform. There are others who believe that the primary need of the day is a "Social gospel," and that the old conception of the ministry of the "word" must be supplanted by a ministry to human needs and life. Even in pastorate and in pulpit, it is proclaimed, even by some who have

abandoned both, theology must yield to sociology. We are assured that to meet the needs of our day we must have in the pulpits not prophets with a message from God and spiritual insight, so much as clerical statesmen with political sagacity and a capacity for practical affairs in the community.

We are confronted to-day as never before with the clamorous urgency of men who have caught the spirit of the social movement, but who have apparently lost that of evangelical Christianity and who in their discussions seem to look upon religion as though it were little more than the art of being good and kind, and who seem to look upon the churches as but little more than community centers which may be used by social reformers as agencies through which to operate a sort of ward headquarters for social workers or a meeting place for a farmers' improvement club.

Out of the conditions and opinions noted there has emerged with many the notion that a church organization devoting itself exclusively to the teaching of Christian truths, existing to fulfill its divinely instituted mission to administer the means of grace and to urge Christian life conduct and activity on people is, in our day, an anachronism and a failure. To insure success in the future the Church, it is declared, must enlarge the scope of its influence in the community. Instead of Christianizing society with the Gospel of Christ, Christianity is to be socialized with the immanent peril that in the process it may be completely secularized. In theological education what we need is seminaries that are to be centers for the exploitation of theories of social reconstruction even if such theories mean the detheologizing of such training schools of the ministry of the churches. Lines have been marked out for this progressive and up-to-date mission of the Church and experiments have been made and are now in practical or impracticable operation, as the case may be.

Among these experiments may be mentioned sewing schools, pharmacies, clinics, amusement halls, reading rooms, athletic clubs, dancing parlors, night schools, intelligence offices, charity agencies, savings banks, "smokers," literary clubs, bathing conveniences, restaurants, free or cheap, and other activities too numerous to mention. While a respectable number of pastors, who have had some experience and observation, have been advocates of such multitudinous church activities, it is affirmed that

the gifted and ardent prophets of these "reforms" are for the most part professors in colleges and universities and who, it is said, in many instances disavow all connection with the Church and seldom ever pass within the portals of the sanctuary. They are usually innocent of all responsibility for organized church life and work. Regarding themselves as divinely appointed monitors, called to supplement the apostolic teachings about the organization and purposes of the Church, these heralds of the better day and ambassadors of theories for other men to make effective, if effectiveness be in them, deliver homilies on the shortcomings of pastors and churches. Their estimate of religious teachers and ministers is that of organizing crusades against manifest wrongs, leading reform movements, and becoming advocates of the multiplied sociological programs that come along in such rapid succession in our day of advanced light and opportunity. And as for the Church it is indifferent to social wrongs if it does not rush headlong into every reform fostered and proclaimed by hot-headed agitators. In the estimate of such prophets about everything that goes wrong in society, business and politics is to be traced to the church door and the pastor's study. If the children are growing up as hoodlums, it is the fault of the Church. If wages are too low and hours too long, it is the fault of the Church. If there is graft in politics, unimproved methods on the farm and poor ventilation in factories, all are marked up to the discredit of a delinquent Church.

It must in all candor be confessed that if one of the new prophets of social regeneration, by means of the Church intruding into other spheres than its own, would only illustrate his reforms by organizing and operating the new and ideal Church it would do much to inspire a larger faith in his preachments. When a writer insists, as was recently done in an issue of the *Survey*, that the Church ought to be busy at teaching the farmer how to raise more stuff and get a better price for it, in the spirit of both justice and fairness we feel that the line ought to be drawn in behalf of the over-worked Church, the real fostering mother of every good thing among us.

In view of some of the preposterous assignments of service now being made to the Church, and the penchant cultivated by many social workers for criticizing and exhorting preachers, it is

not surprising that there has been some indulgence in satire. The implication or assumption so often met with, that there has been no help given people as to the needs and opportunities of the life that now is finds fresh expression in the following from an article entitled "Farmer Smith and the Country Church." The pastor of this particular country church is represented as having come to the conclusion that he had been preaching too much about Elysian fields and not enough about the state of affairs in the farming region about Stony Creek. He therefore apostrophizes after this fashion:

"Forgive me, Mr. Smith; I am not going to do it any more. I am going to take an interest in your everyday affairs—your crops, your stock, your markets, your school, your lodge and your recreations. I am going to see if I can help you in your effort to get your boy started on a farm of his own. I've preached a long time against Sabbath baseball; now I'm going to try to give your children so much recreation through the week that they won't care for it on Sabbath. I am going to take as one of the articles of my creed, 'I believe in better roads for Smith, and I propose to have them.' I am going to try to save you and your family not only for paradise; but for America and American farms."

As another example of this particular kind of contemporary writing I adduce what was recently quoted in the *Literary Digest*, from a Methodist paper in which a satirical picture is presented of the supposed condition of things in a New York church of the future:

"The Rev. Pelatiah W. Jinks, who was called to the highest pulpit in New York in 1912, succeeded within less than three years in building up an unrivaled system of dancing-academies and roller-skating rinks for young people. Under him the attendance at the Sunday afternoon sparring exhibitions in the vestry-rooms of the church increased from an average of 54 to an average of 650. In spite of the nominal fee charged for the use of the congregation's bowling alleys, the income from that source alone was sufficient to defray the cost of missionary work in all Africa. We are told that this was only the beginning of the Rev. Jinks' 'glorious services.' Ten years later he could point with pride to the fact that the football team of his church won the championship of the Ecclesiastical League of New York.

"Jinks afterward undertook to build up the chapel at St. Basil on the East Side, whose congregation had been steadily dwindling. A moving-picture plant was installed in the church forthwith, and immediately the former empty pews were filled to overflowing. The new departure worked so well that Jinks resolved to introduce other innovations. To encourage church attendance at Sunday morning services he established a tipless barber shop. Two years later, in spite of the murmured protest of the conservative element in his congregation, he erected one of the finest Turkish baths in New York City.

"Another clergyman, Boots by name, envious of Jinks' success, began to preach on "Does Radium Cure Cancer?" "Dr. Cook and the North Pole," "Zola and His Place in Literature," "The Position of the Women in the Fiji Islands," etc.'"

If this increase of contemplated social control for the Church through increasing complexity of the social structure and resulting social pressure and dependence of the individual goes on are we not likely to have a Church prostituted from its noble and unique vocation, so that it shall become an offense to right-minded, spiritual Christians and an insult to the Head of the Church? Moral education is harder than external moral discipline, but it touches the mainspring of human progress, and the Church that promotes this kind of education accordingly deserves the enthusiastic support of these reformers rather than sympathetic criticism and the instituting of agencies and theories that are based upon nothing more permanent and effective than the restraining agency of the law.

The cry for a socialistic evangelism has become very popular in some quarters. Society must be saved we are told. The community of men must be saved simultaneously. And yet we are not told how society can be saved without the salvation of the individual. The question is shall we refuse to build houses because we cannot lay all the bricks at one time, or shall we continue to make good bricks and carefully lay each one in its own proper place? Shall we adopt the principles of this school of church socialization in the education of our children by declaring that each one need not study for himself, for we propose to educate the bulk by some method of pedagogic "hocus-pocus" that works effectively with boys and girls in the aggregate? Is there not some danger that we shall push the wheels of our ecclesiasti-

cal progress back to the time before which our Lord asked the question, "What shall it profit a man if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?" that time when society was everything and the individual nothing, when men did not feel personal responsibility or realize personal worth but were content to remain slaves in the bulk? Indeed the current discussion on both religious and sociological problems makes it more and more manifest that the world has not changed much since our Lord's day. Greeks, Romans and Jews are yet with us, the men who expect to save men from sin and its entailed misery by education, legislation, moral culture or an improved environment.

Presumably all of us realize to-day that the Church has a social function. It is likely also that most of us would agree that the Church is not now fully performing this social function and ought to do more. But when we go a step further and undertake to say what that function is, we find a plethora of answers and many of them distressingly superficial. On every hand we are hearing the voices of the heralds of the "social gospel." The "social conscience" is not always carefully defined, but one thing is certain, it is something that has been sufficiently aroused as to be pressing for attention. In wide circles the tendency is pronounced to make society rather than the man the unit of salvation and the accent accordingly is being placed more and more upon social service and reconstruction rather than upon individual salvation. It is of vast importance that the Church should know all the facts obtainable about the cotemporary social situation, about classes and conditions existing among us, and in the face of which it must carry on its work. But we are constrained to believe that both the cause of social betterment and the work of the Church will suffer, if for any reason or because of any pressure from the outside, the latter is in any measure turned aside from its primary work which is the bringing in of the kingdom of God wherein dwelleth righteousness, peace and joy.

There is certainly enough to divert the minds of men from the one great cause for which the Church exists. Thousands are wholly absorbed in business and the pursuit of wealth, and many of our great cities at night seem to be transformed into great pleasure palaces. There are strong and influential factors at work in society that constantly show trends toward the stomach



only and to a revamping of the old cry of a degenerate and now passed away civilization, for "bread and the circus." All of us are constantly under the impact of material things and most people are much more interested in the construction of vast buildings, gigantic steamships, high-hung bridges, great inter-oceanic canals and airships than they are in the things of the spirit. It would be folly to affirm that the advent of the machine, the consolidation of industry, the concentration of wealth, absentee capitalism, the rise of the labor unions and a facility of communication which has brought the whole world into competition have had no impact upon the Church, its life and its methods. But all of this only makes it all the more important that the Church, the one institution of divine appointment among men that deals with the soul, shall not be induced to minimize its high calling and abdicate its divinely assigned throne of influence.

A social service catechism recently published, has this for its first question: "What is social service?" and the answer is, "Social service is that form of effort for man's betterment which seeks to uplift and transform his associated and community life." There is advantage in having the subject defined, and the definition might be accepted as legitimate, if it were put forth by a civil government or a municipality. The definition is properly constricted no doubt; but we are unable to subscribe to it as pertaining to the duties and privileges of the Christian as such. The definition has nothing to say about Christ or salvation. It is strictly mundane. Christianity seeks to supply man's needs with the Gospel and its first and continuous aim is to lead men to become Christians and then to edify and establish them more and more in the principles of the Gospel. Its motto is to "do good, unto all men, especially to them who are of the household of faith." "Let the dead bury their dead, but go thou and preach the kingdom of God," is the method of procedure, indicated by the Head and founder of the Church, for the accredited and authorized teachers of the Church. He who turns aside to "efforts for man's betterment," before he has preached to men the gospel of salvation, and before the man has accepted it, is not obeying the command and following the method of his Maker and the world's Redeemer. The making of Christian manhood and womanhood is the Church's peculiar problem. In that sphere lies her primary duties. How best to use and apply the tools

which God himself has placed in her hands, viz., the Word and the Sacraments, that is her problem. She deals with the fountains of life and character and applies her remedial work there.

Our Savior when He was in the world in the days of His flesh was not indifferent to any human want and went about doing good as He had opportunity, healing the sick, giving sight to the blind, laying His healing touch upon poor lepers, as well as teaching and preaching the gospel of His kingdom. The Church ought not to be, and is not, indifferent to human needs. Her mission is the redemption of society by means of divinely appointed agencies. Her purpose is the transformation of the kingdoms of this world into the kingdom of her Lord and of His Christ. The Church, therefore, could lose interest in the social question only by becoming untrue to her mission and so to her Head. To save society for Christ is the work of the Church. Her method is that of the real reformer who reforms from within, the method of her Lord and Head who remakes a sin-stricken race. It has never turned a deaf ear to the bitter cry of child laborers, to the complaint of over-worked and under-fed women, to the solemn indictment registered by men who are denied a living wage and to the heart-broken protests of the victims of intemperance and prostitution. But in its sympathetic touch with all these the great mission of the Church of Jesus Christ is to preach the Gospel of regeneration rather than of reformation. It is primarily and characteristically individual in its work and above all religious. It contemplates saving men rather from sin than from poverty, making them "new creatures in Christ Jesus" rather than providing for them better opportunities for education, culture and industrial liberation. If it places the proper emphasis upon its own peculiar tasks it will do its best service in advancing all forms and expressions of social righteousness. The first and second great commandments are yet the basis of all true living of man both Godward and manward. Properly and amply interpreted and applied these are broad enough and deep enough for all human needs and sufficiently dynamic to transform the whole of human life. The strong words of Carlyle are in order, "Human crimes are many, but the crime of being deaf to God's voice, of being blind to all but parchments and antiquarian rubrics when the divine handwriting is abroad on the sky—certainly there is no crime which the

Supreme Powers do more terribly avenge." The important thing is this, if Carlyle's dictum be true, that above all the turbulent voices of the social unrest of our time, the quickening, regenerating and reconstructing voice of God shall be heard. In a regenerative as contrasted with a reformatory gospel it shall be heard to best advantage.

We are sometimes told by the propagandists of the social gospel that what the Church most of all needs to-day is to catch the spirit of the age. But this is a monstrous mistake. As Dr. Campbell Morgan, one of the world's great preachers, has recently said:

"What the Church supremely needs is to correct the spirit of the age. The Church in Corinth, catching the spirit of Corinth, became anaemic, weak, and failed to deliver the message of God to Corinth. The Church of God in London, invaded by the spirit of London, the materialism, militarism, sordidness, and selfishness, of London, is too weak to save London."

It is when the Church has been most invaded by the spirit of the age or of the city that it becomes a powerless Church lacking in that unction and aggressive, but distinctive, force in meeting the real needs of the times. Attempts to run the Church on worldly principles have been dismal failures, so far as the real purposes of religion were concerned. "There are," said a recently deceased and gifted English preacher, "some who would have the Church sit at the feet of the successful business man. They rise in our councils, these baptized worldlings, and talk as if the things we really need could be picked up in the head office of a smart and hustling firm. They say we do not speak the language of the people, and are not sufficiently in touch with all the swift, subtle changes in the world's shifting and complex life. And such criticism is wrong, as all shallow things are wrong. It is not this world we need to know better, it is the other world. It is not the language of the street we need to master; it is the language of the Kingdom where he reigns whose voice has the music and throb of many waters. We need to move with surer step and keener vision and warmer response amid eternal things."

Above the multitudinous voices that reflect the spirit of any age men need to hear the admonitory voice of the Church saying: first make your peace with God as an individual; then will you

become a member of society who need not be taught his duty to his fellowmen, and a condition of society will be produced in which justice and equality are more and more established among men. The Church, let it always be remembered, is the supreme trustee of that unearthly kingdom for which man and history exist.

The efforts at this socialization plan for the Churches, it should be said, have not been so signally successful as to inspire confidence in the wisdom of the Church in our day, amplifying the sphere of its activities. In the experiments some have made to cause the Church to have the versatility of becoming all things to all communities, and, so come in touch with all classes we have had what is known among us as the "institutional Church."

Now the adaptation of Church and pastor to the special needs of a community is quite a different thing from organizing for all the conveniences and necessities of human society in every place as certain of the specialists in ecclesiastical sociology suggest.

Such institutionalism is not the New Testament ideal. I should not refer to this were not the advocates of the plan insistent that their scheme of church utility is a "going back to Christ."

Our Lord in the days of His earthly ministry did little to aid people in their temporal and physical needs. He did not put money in anybody's purse. He released no prisoners and visited no jails or police stations. He released no captives except the spiritually bound. He opened no prison doors to the bruised except those bruised by sin. He fed the hungry people on several occasions only, so far as we know, and no more, and that after they had spent a whole day listening to His preaching.

It is said of Jesus in advocacy of the new views that He went about "helping the needy, adjusting the relations of men, and seeking to establish justice among men." But this is just what He did not do and refused to do. He expressly refused to interfere in the human affairs of men. A certain one came to Him asking that He interfere for a better division of an inheritance. He refused saying, "Man, who made Me a judge or a divider over you." He taught His disciples that they were brethren. He said to His disciples, "The kingdom of God is among you," and yet He declared to Pilate: "My kingdom is not of this world." He never went to a magistrate to intercede for

a prisoner, and never complained of authorities that they were oppressive in their rule. Free churches, amusements, and sewing societies have been mostly the objects on which attention has hitherto been focalized. But we find no trace of this kind of "institutionalism" in the apostolic Church. For a time at least there was a community of property; but that seems to have been only a local and temporary expedient, and compulsory on no one. "Collections" were taken to assist the poor disciples, and "seven deacons" were appointed to care for widows. Throughout the history of the Church in the early centuries we discover abundant evidence of charity and beneficence to the poor and needy, but we find no intimation that the Church was a kind of department store for the temporary commodities of life. Some of the features of this kind of work it is alleged by those who have studied sociological problems, may serve to alleviate temporary needs, but in the end serve only to create systematic mendicancy and professional pauperism.

Nor is it any more a function of the Church to provide amusements for its members and as a ground of attraction for those who are without. There are men, women and organizations better equipped for this business than devout pastors or deacons, the King's Daughters or the whole local body of believers organized for that purpose.

One of the latest and even ludicrous suggestions along this line of "institutionalism," is the proposition that ministers of the Church should add to their other suggested forms of special equipment for their vocation, courses in agriculture in order that they may instruct the farmers of the country churches in the one thing about which farmers are supposed to know something.

This proposal it is safe to presume, comes from urban theorists who could not tell a "hawk from a handsaw." But they have had under their consideration "the challenge of the country." Having already met the challenge of the city to their satisfaction, and being over fond of "challenges" they now feel the urgency of a remedy for the rural "problem," and accordingly we are having this proposed addition to pastoral equipment. What the farmer wants in his preacher is what every man wants in his preacher, and that want is a good preacher and a faithful and sympathetic pastor equipped for the responsibilities and duties of his own high calling. It would be just as sensible to advise

that preachers in the city should be taught book-keeping, banking, manufacturing and other urban arts in order to qualify them for their work in the city as to urge that those who live in the country should study agriculture to qualify them for greater efficiency in a ministry to a rural population. The scientific study of soils, fertilizers, silos and the rotation of crops is all very good in its way and in its place. But in the name of pure and unde-filed religion, let us insist that "the committee on the betterment of country life," shall keep its hands off the country churches if it has nothing better to propose than that the pastors of those churches shall be given courses in agriculture. When a farmer sends for a doctor he sends for him to get medical treatment and not for advice about sowing peas, draining land and raising pigs, and likewise when he desires a preacher he wants spiritual help and not agricultural counsel.

It may be that the "institutional" church in some of its aspects has a function in some places, but as an expression of social Christianity it is ordinarily a disappointment. There is nothing distinctive in it to promote social justice, which is the thing wanted above all else. It is very expensive and very commonly has been found like Longfellow's road in the western country, which started out broad and shady but finally ended in a squirrel track and ran up a tree.

The judgment of men who have had experience is not reassuring. I can adduce here but one example out of many that might be adduced. It is that of a devout and capable Episcopal rector who had ample experience and who is known personally by the writer. He has expressed himself as having no faith in the "short-cut-across-the-fields" plan of filling the churches, and as not believing that the gymnasium and the boys' club and similar auxiliaries counted much as a method of catching men for Christ. Out of a membership of 160, in an athletic club run under the auspices of the Church in two years he succeeded in getting only two interested in religious work. In another city out of a boys' club of 136, only two crossed the threshold of the parish house into the Church. In his investigations he had found in New York a parish house accommodating a men's club of 800, a boys' club of 600, and a working girls' club of 1200. In four years there were 6000 admissions to the parish house and out of all that number but one entered the church—"and he died." The



rector further enforced the truth indicated in these admonitory figures by saying this:

"I have confidence in the religion that makes its impression on the souls of men. Pull religion down from the spire, carry it from the chancel into the open, but be guarded against delusions. There is a variety of philanthropic, humanitarian and pseudo-religious bodies engaged in useful work, and therein lie certain delusions. I believe I see in our modern life a lamentable lack of ability to think as clearly as we ought to in making our distinctions between what is religious and what is not. Some of the acts of charity, philanthropy and benevolence, all actuated by good motives make for good; others do hurt."

The rector further gave it as his judgment that "It is a fallacious notion, that you can catch men by the fish-net process. The hook-and-line plan is the only way—you must get them one at a time. It is easy to fill a large church. Attack the mayor in a sermon, announce that you will apologize, and next Sunday the church will be crowded."

He holds that the only organizations within the Church that have been a long-continued success are those that began with a religious purpose, and have adhered to that purpose. "The others," he declared, "are a nuisance."

Two great preachers of our generation not long before the death of the older were engaged in talking about some proposed "institutional" work in the churches of England. Dr. Alexander Maclaren said to Dr. J. H. Jowett, "It will take a lot of billiards to make a Christian."

That this socialization movement has influenced public sentiment is manifest in a variety of forms. In what are declared to be religious Journals we are constantly encountering editorials on such subjects as these, "The constitutionality of laws for human betterment," "The discussion on church unity," "The Philippine question," "State pensions for teachers and others," "The Cornell civic and social committee," "Nebraska's conception of the carrying of concealed weapons," "The social ethics of fire laws," "Cooperation of rural churches in promoting the public health," "The labor cause and the teaching of Christianity," "The decay of Pessimism," "The joint commission on social service." Each and all of these editorials pertain to subjects of the passing day, and not to the verities and claims of religion. Not

one of these movements referred to is specifically religious, but every one of them has just enough of a religious semblance and an ethical blending to appeal to those who are not discriminating as something of urgent practical concern in the list of contemporary problems. Each of these subjects is either social or moral rather than purely spiritual. They are of transient rather than eternal significance. The primacy in such subjects is found in the establishment of justice and equality among men, and not in the establishment of rightful relations between man and God.

This tendency has also not left the message of many a pulpit uninfluenced by its encroachments, and we have had a flood-tide of semi-secular themes presented before assemblies of people met for religious purposes; assemblies in which the hungry sheep look up and are not fed. We have had a large output of homiletic wares dealing with pseudo-science, superficial attempts at literary interpretation, second-hand sociology, politico-moral reforms, ethical platitudes, pretentious efforts at biblical criticism, shallow discussions of current events and withal a deplorable destitution of the gospel of salvation by grace. In consequence of the pressure of this socializing tendency in the church many preachers have ceased to be preachers in their vain efforts to be something else. We are having too much preaching about external conditions instead of that which indicates study of the Scriptures, fervent prayer, deep consecration to the right things in the ministry and profound concern for a real divinely sent and conferred human salvation. We need a restoration of sure-enough preaching in pulpits from which it has been excluded by sociological fadists, humanitarian doctors and secularized prophets. There is really no significant reason for going to church outside of distinctively religious needs, and when the pulpit abdicates its own functions and undertakes to supply discussions of the new order instead it always loses the attention of men. That preaching that is an adulteration of a divine salvation with human values is always a powerless preaching.

Religious work is being seriously affected by a proposed fundamental principle to the effect that men are naturally good and need only the chance that is induced by pleasant surroundings to insure a perfect manhood. In a book but recently issued I find this "We must believe in the light of the new social philosophy of our time, that human nature is good and not bad. Man's sin,

like his disease and poverty, is to be attributed primarily to the social and economic conditions of his environment."

One of the leading sociologists of the day has been saying this, "Sin is misery. Misery is poverty. The antidote of poverty is income." Even in the face of the emphatic words of our Lord, "Ye must be born again," this sort of philosophy is pervading religious life everywhere and subtly but powerfully affecting its activities. If the only antidote to sin is income, then more and more we shall continue to emphasize physical ministries, pouring our money into social settlements that exhaust their energies in discussing economic questions and caring for men's bodies, and more and more we shall ignore those agencies that seek to nourish men's souls.

In these proposals also to carry the church into social action Jesus, the Lord from Heaven, is described as a sympathetic forerunner of the new social revolution. In his book entitled "Social teachings of the Christian Church" Ernst Troeltsch speaks of discussions of this theme by "people who regard it as the historian's specific task to be wiser than his documents, and to consider everything else more probable, more possible, than what the sources say." In our time such persons rather frequently tell us that Jesus is to be understood primarily as the prophet of a new economic order, as the spokesman of "the people" against "the lords," as the agitator of proletariat uprising, and as the instigator of industrial revolt and revolution. He is described as a socialist, or as a syndicalist, or at the other extreme as an anarchist. Such statements with one phrasing and another, and with greater or less positiveness, are common in books, addresses and in sermons. The Sermon on the Mount has been called a treatise on political economy. To judge it as an economic utterance is ludicrous. Who has ever heard of a modern social reformer addressing an audience of turbulent workingmen on their economic welfare, and bidding them take no thought for the morrow, to lay by no savings for the future, and not to take thought for life or food or clothing, but to trust to the Providence that cares for grass and flowers and birds? There are of course enormous social values in the religious messages of Christ. But that is because religion is a deeper and stronger force than any other in lifting human lives toward the ideal. The only final solution of any social problem is found in Our Lord's

thought of the divine Fatherhood and the human brotherhood, that offers the one effective and permanent solvent of the one fundamental ill of unbrotherliness between man and man.

In contemplation of the theories, therefore, for social readjustment, and facing all the facts obtained by the widest induction, we are always forced back to the conclusion that the church of the living God will best serve the ends sought in the organization of society, by strictly adhering to its divinely designated mission. "As the Father hath sent me so send I you." "The Son of Man has come to seek and to save the lost." It is the business of the church to preach, live and apply the message of the gospel to the deepest and most comprehensive needs of mankind. Any deflection from this task to manage charities, amusements, athletics, technical schools, financial projects, and like enterprises will certainly paralyze its energies, weaken its influence, and cripple its efficiency. It is already suffering from a burden of extraneous interests. "Christianity and civilization" says Principal Forsythe, "are two quite different things. They have many points of contact and reciprocal relations but they are not identical. Indeed at points they are antagonistic. Civilization develops a religion, but what Christianity has in charge is a salvation—even from the religion of civilization." Christianity it is which crystalizes the Grace of God. The Gospel stands for a new creation from above. It is a rejuvenative force and not a reformatory agency. It contemplates something more than the mere refinement of the natural man, and the church as something more than the organized aspect of the religious side of natural society. Christianity did not come merely to canonize the natural man, nor to complete his spiritual evolution, not merely to soften his selfishness with kindness and sympathy but to regenerate him from the center of his being and introduce him into a redeemed society. It contemplates sin as something more than a mere case of atavism, the recurrence of an unfortunate ancestral trait and a misfortune to be deplored. The redemption it is commissioned to proclaim is something more than an improved environment, or a modification or centralizing of the evil influence of the past.

In our day the phrase "The Kingdom of God," has been used with much freedom as summing up a big variety of problems to be solved. Much of this freedom has been anticipated in the

appearance in 1885, of Canon Fremantle's widely influential book entitled "The World as the subject of Redemption." But it is just here in this freedom that the root of the difference lies, and from this difference there issues a diversity in the object to be obtained and the work to be done. The Kingdom of God signifies the rule or reign of God. According to the Scriptures this reign of God has three manifestations: In creation as God's wisdom, power and goodness; in Redemption, as God's grace towards lost and sinning men; in its final completion as the kingdom of glory, wherein the will of God will be done on earth as it is in heaven. The work of creation is finished according to the Scriptures. The kingdom of glory is yet to come. But now is the day of grace the time of the process and work connected with redemption. This is the sphere of the church's work, and it is not its business to invade the sphere of Christian citizenship and assume responsibilities that belong elsewhere. What has the church, as a church, to do with "uniform laws," "proper regulations," "provision of proper education and recreation," "proper housing," "reasonable reduction in hours of labor," "higher wages," the "equitable distribution of the products of industry," etc., objects named in the platforms of the great political parties, one of the places where such subjects belong. The membership of the churches can do much to sway public opinion and stir public sentiment, and the church can preach and teach principles of justice and righteousness but it should not be charged with the responsibilities which belong to Christian citizens. Its chief business is to go out after men one by one and lead them in penitence to the cross there to be transformed from men of godlessness and selfishness into men of righteousness and love. The evils of society can be affected radically and cured permanently only as the gospel is applied to men as individuals. The work of rescue is by divine appointment, carried forward by preaching, by the word, by prayer, and by the power and presence of the Holy Ghost. This is everywhere pressed in the New Testament. It is the great commission, "Go preach; heal the sick; cast out devils; freely you have received, freely give." Christ fed the multitude but enjoined them that they "labor not for the meat that perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto eternal life, which the Son of Man shall give." The disciples at the beginning gave themselves wholly to the word and

to prayer. Paul claimed that he was not even sent to baptize, but to preach. Much of the work classed in our day as social service belongs to the work of restraint. It is largely dependent upon the presence of men who have been born of God, who are as the "salt of the earth" and "the light of the world." It is the church that is unceasingly proclaiming the principles of the Kingdom of God, that is doing the most to usher in the day long promised when the world shall be brought together in brotherhood.

The world is not crying out for a church that will run an educational establishment and amusement places and charity associations so much as it is needing a church, that, disdaining the advertising methods of the discouraged shopkeeper, is teaching men to walk justly and humbly before God. Sin is internal and constitutional. Human misery is external and functional. Shifting from the internal to the external leads the church into strange ventures in the use of means and methods. It magnifies recreation as a means of relief for the monotony of life, narrows the view of human need and shifts the responsibility from the person to society, from personal transgression to bad economics, from principles to machinery. We have tried many remedies. We have legislated but much of it is grim mockery. We have educated and those trained in a multitude of instances have only become bolder, quicker and smarter in the use of trained capacities. There is but one remedy, which in all the history of our race has ever been found able to check the evil and remove the sin, and that is repentance toward God, and faith in Jesus Christ his Son. Here and here only is our hope. In one of the fine addresses made at the Centennial of Princeton Theological Seminary, it was said:

"When we speak of efficiency and social service, let us not forget our church history. Let us look at Luther and Calvin, and what they accomplished and how they accomplished it. Luther and Calvin might have studied history and psychology and political and social science till they were as old as Methusaleh, and they would not have produced one tittle of the political and social results that they did achieve by studying the Bible, by translating the Bible, by expounding the Bible and by building as they believed, upon the Bible great systems of doctrine and duty."



"In the name of efficiency, let us put the most important things first. Let us not crowd in the squash courts and Turkish baths and palm gardens, if they have to crowd out the life boats."

Let us quit the heresy of conceiving of sin as chiefly social and not personal, and call the Church back to the ministry of the Word, to renewed attention to her great themes of life and salvation. In this it may be that it must be unpopular with some men that it may be popular with man's God. We shall never have a new society until we have new and transformed men. It is not enough to go on singing "throw out the life line." Life, life itself is the most urgent need; divine energy within men. We must learn to put the kingdom of God first and the loaves and fishes, however necessary they may be, second. We must learn once more to place the proper estimate upon the redemption and sanctifying power God hath set in the supremacy in this world. Men must be called back to the great truth that Christianity addresses itself primarily to men as individuals; that in its proper action, its purpose and its business is to make men saints; that **what it has to do with souls, is far other, both in its discipline and its scope from what it has to do with nations or societies.** We must learn to place a new emphasis upon personal sin instead of indulging ourselves in fulminations against that selfishness which has its roots and expressions in sin.

Plutarch has a parable of a man who tried to make a dead body stand upright, but who finished his labors saying: "*Deest aliquid intus*"—"There's something lacking inside." There are no grounds of hope for a real "social revival" upon the basis of what one of our most influential journals calls the "present tendency to serve God without God."

In view of all now that we have said and much more that might be adduced, we are glad to note the fact that great church leaders are once more calling men back to a new emphasis on the Church and what it is in the world for.

It is both significant and gratifying to note this emphasis now being placed upon the Church and its function by men thoroughly qualified for such judgment. It is what is now a marked feature in the expressed views of men who know something not only of the history of the Church and its place in the organization of society, but, likewise, what the Scriptures teach on the subject. We might adduce here what many of the most capable

religious leaders are now saying on this subject, as, for example, the able editor of *The British Weekly*, Dr. Robertson Nicoll. We would adduce here what has recently been said by such competent leaders, one, a Scotchman, the second an Englishman, and the third an American. Unquestionably the leader in theological thought to-day in Scotland is Dr. James Denney, great also as a preacher. Speaking of the Church and its place, in the June issue of *The Constructive Quarterly*, he says: "Even loyal members of the Church may be in need of enlightenment on this point. They are interested in various good causes, economical, social, political and what not; and, because the Church in some sense must be interested in all good causes, they would like to see it taking a more active part with them. They are eager to take it by force and enlist it under their banner, as the multitudes would have taken Jesus by force and made Him a king; and, when it is slow to move, they are apt to denounce it as indifferent to evil and hostile to progress. What needs to be made plain is that while there are many cases in which the Church and, let us say for illustration, the State or trades union or political societies may have the same ethical ends in view, the Church is not at liberty, as a spiritual society, to use all the means in pursuing those ends which are appropriate and legitimate for others. Granted, for example, that temperance is a great moral interest, it does not follow that the Church should directly promote any particular piece of temperance legislation, such as a high license law, an election law, a local option law, or whatever it may be. It has its own motives and weapons for fighting intemperance and it does not gain strength, it only loses the consciousness of what it is when it snatches the weapons of the State and tries to wield them instead of its own."

One of the most brilliant and productive men among the leaders in English Christianity is Principal Forsyth. He is a man of rare gifts and a student of current problems in Church and State. In his latest volume he says, in speaking of some of the weaknesses of his own body, the Congregationalists: "The Church that becomes more of a democracy than a Church is doomed. It takes all the loftiness of a great Church to keep the State high and enable it to resist the gravitation of human nature to Pagan dust. Nothing but the liberty whose secret is with the Church alone can serve or secure the liberty of the State. It

is foolish, of course, to say that the Church has nothing to do with politics. But are we to debase the Church to a political lever or a servant of society, so that its public action should be chiefly as an organ of political pressure or a tool of social reform?"

One of the sanest discussions of the relation of the Church to various phases of social reform we have seen is that of Prof. Howerton. He is a minister of the Presbyterian Church in the South. He has been Moderator of the General Assembly and is an honored teacher in one of his church's institutions. He says: "The Church, therefore, as an organization cannot and ought not to engage in secular reforms, political or economic. She always makes mischief when she does so. She turns aside from her own proper mission, and, at the same time, violates the freedom of conscience of her members. The only real good the Church has ever done, in advancing such reforms, is by her influence in forming the character, the principles, and the motives of the men and women whose real business in life is to engage in such services to business, to society and the State. She can reform law by reforming the lawyers and judges. She can reform politics by reforming the politicians. She can reform business by reforming business men. She can reform society by reforming social leaders and in no other way."

Dean Shailer Mathews of the University of Chicago and President of the Federal Council of the Churches is not usually classed as a conservative. But on the subject under discussion he has certainly spoken advisedly and timely. He can rarely be safely quoted when he touches the question of the higher criticism or the teachings of the Scriptures concerning justification through the atonement; but he frequently surprises us with the sanity of his views on vital issues that threaten to undermine the power of the Church as a spiritual, redemptive agency. What the Dean says on this point will do much to make our position still clearer, and is worthy of restatement.

"A danger to which Protestantism—particularly progressive Protestantism—in America is exposed, is that its churches shall become mere agents of social service. There are many people who, in reaction from extreme orthodoxy, have come to feel that the sole business of the Church is to push social reform. This danger is particularly strong in America just now because social

workers have come to see that the Church, instead of being hostile to their ideals, is the greatest force by which their ideals can be put into operation. Such a valuing of the Church brings no small satisfaction to those of us who have endeavored to set forth the social significance of the spiritual life.

"But we cannot let social service take the place of God. People cannot be amused into conscientiousness. Picnics are not the equivalents of prayer-meetings, and Sunday-school baseball leagues have not yet developed into revivals. It was natural in a period of awakening and transition that men should jump to the conclusion that the Church ought to stand for every good cause. It was easy to forget that society will organize institutions for each newly realized need.

"But even those of us who feel most deeply the social obligations of Christianity see that a Church as an institution does not have the same field of responsibility as Christian individuals. Those last may be organized in a great variety of institutions, each of which performs some particular function set by the division of labor in our world. Church leaders can delegate to these institutions certain duties, but they cannot delegate the duties of spiritual parentage. A Protestant Church cannot be an ethical orphan asylum; it must be a home in which souls are born into newness of life.

"We want efficiency in organization and in activity. We want our ministers to be alive to the needs of the hour in politics and in industrial reform, quick to come to the championship of overworked women in factories, and the rescue of little children who are giving up their lives that the cost of production may be kept low. We want the message from the pulpit to be heartily in sympathy with our modern thinking. But most of all does American Protestantism need a spiritual passion, a contagious faith in the supremacy of God's spiritual order, and an alarm at the misery that waits on sin.

"From many a community there is already rising a cry for elemental religion. With all their scientific and business success, American laymen are asserting that they want to be assured of God and immortality and the worth of righteousness. They want companionship in spiritual loneliness, comfort in hours of pain, courage in moments of moral wavering. Their souls are athirst for the Unknown, and they will be satisfied with nothing

save the water that comes from the river of God. If the awakening of Protestantism were to mean simply a renaissance of ethics, or a sort of bescriptured positivism, American society would be defrauded. When it asks for the bread of life, it will not be satisfied with treatises on eugenics."

Dean Mathews is a bright man who is always interesting even when he does not command one's assent. More recently he has been speaking further about methods for "tinkering up society that has gone wrong." Here are his words uttered at a recent dinner of the missionary societies of the nation: "You cannot save the world by going into anti-tuberculosis societies. The needs of the age are not to be met by the mere preaching of good Samaritanism. Christ is a great Re-creator, not a reformer. The Church is not the jack of all reforms. The Church has a function, and the first item in it is to convict the world of sin."

Professor Wallis is also of the big Chicago school. In a recent book published by the University Press, which shows him to be an eager reformer along the new lines but at the same time shows the danger to Churches from sociological trends, he holds that political and economic programs resulting from the increased interest in sociological problems is a peril to religious growth. He says: "More and more we hear it said that the Church machinery should put itself behind projects of social reform, such as liquor legislation, child labor, unionism and socialism. If the Church should lend itself to social reform, it would have to take a definite position with regard to politics and economics. But men have always differed about politics, and if this view of church life prevails, those who do not favor the particular programs adopted by their Church cannot support the organization."

Here, too, is another admonition from one of our able contemporaries, the *Journal and Messenger*: "There is a general tendency of secular organizations to make use of the churches to carry out their projects. That a church should exist for higher purposes never seems to occur to them. Their fads, perhaps their important reforms, are more to them than Christianity, or any of the principles which have made the churches what they are. Some of these objects are good. Concerning others, there is wide difference of opinion, and church members, acting as individuals, ought to take what they think is the right course. We

cannot expect every member of a church to think in the same way on every subject. These secular organizations want to drag the churches at their chariot wheels. They would make use of them, and throw them aside contemptuously when the object is gained. We have a higher ideal of the purposes for which a Christian church is formed. Many church members are unthinkingly led into the support of a measure, by cant. The literary bureau which is paid to push the project has learned, not to use religious terms with correctness and discrimination, but to deal in a few pious phrases which sound religious to superficial Christians. A circular just received, pushing a secular project, has a religious department; that is its scheme to make a cat's paw of the churches. Such a course ought to defeat the project. Even if the reform is good, why should secular societies dictate to the churches what reforms they shall push?"

We deem it timely to reproduce here the words of a wise master builder in the kingdom of God, the late Dr. Alexander Mac-laren, who was increasingly distrustful of all schemes and plans calculated in any measure to turn the Church aside from its great work of ministering to the souls of men.

Dr. Maclaren says: "God forbid that I should not give full weight to all other methods for the partial reformation and the bettering of humanity. I would wish them all Godspeed. But brethren, there is nothing else that will deal with my sin in its relation to God, or in its relation to my character, or in its relation to my future, except the message of the Gospel. There are plenty of other things, very helpful and very good in their places, but I do want to say in one word, that there is nothing else that goes deep enough. Education? Yes, it will do a great deal, but it will do nothing in regard to sin. It will alter the type of the disease, because the cultured man's transgressions will be very different from those of the illiterate poor. But wise or foolish, professor, student, thinker or savage, with narrow forehead and all but dead brain, are alike in this, that they are sinners in God's sight. I would that I could get through the fence, that some of you have reared round you, on the ground of your superior enlightenment and education and refinement, and make you feel that there is something deeper than all that, and that you may be a very clever and a very well-educated, a very highly-cul-



tured, an extremely thoughtful and philosophical sinner, but you are a sinner all the same."

The great preachers, the successful men who are preaching to great congregations are rising in their places to protest against this socialization of the Church. In our language to-day there are no more capable, brilliant and popular preachers than two that may be named, viz., Dr. John Henry Jowett and Dr. Charles E. Jefferson. Speaking in his book, "The Preacher," about the "broadening conception of the preacher's mission," Jowett says, "Men may become so absorbed in social wrongs as to miss the deeper malady of personal sin. They may lift the rod of oppression and leave the burden of guilt. They may seem to correct social dislocations and overlook the awful disorder of the soul. It seems to me that some preachers have made up their minds to live in the Old Testament rather than in the New, and to walk with the prophet rather than with the apostle and evangelist."

In his great sermon before the Council of the Congregational Churches recently held at Kansas City, and which dealt with the fundamental question of the quest after God, Dr. Jefferson said, "They tell us we must socialize religion. This is the way to do it. The God of the New Testament is a social God—preach Him! We are urged to stir the people to social service. This is the way to do it. When a boy, Wendell Phillips heard a sermon on the soul's responsibility to God, and when he became a man he struck slavery. We are told to Christianize the social order. This is the place to begin. The way to Christianize the social order is to Christianize the souls of men."

In his famous book of some years ago entitled "Social Evolution," Professor Kidd has shown that in humanity itself there resides no power of progress. The ocean steamship that has burned its last pound of coal may proceed on its course by virtue of its momentum, but it is simply a question of the clock how soon it will cease to move except as it is tossed about at the option of wind and waves. Not only is there power lacking for the good, but apart from God's grace the evil tendencies constantly become more aggravated. Society never will be better than the men and women who compose it. Individual regeneration must precede social reconstruction that gives any assurance of permanency. The Christian principle is the improvement of

society through renewed individuals who belong to the world as well as to the Church. In its application the leverage and the approach to moral improvement is always within. Socialism is doomed to failure until it becomes Christian and grounds the arms of its hostility to the Church. It is regeneration or degeneration—the beginning of an upward movement by a power not of man's self, or the continuance and increase of a downward movement that can end only in ruin.

In our land to-day there are marshalled, it may be all the elements of a social Armageddon. The symptoms of the modern world resemble in many striking particulars the dissolution of the ancient states; there is the same measureless social discontent, much of political instability, the emergence of hybrid forms in religion and morals, and the gathering to a head of revolutionary forces. Every advanced civilization has passed through the same struggle with evil through which we are now passing. We may see it in the Antediluvians, in Chaldea, Sodom, Egypt, Babylon, Greece and Rome. The riot of social evils marks the last stage of any civilization. This is not due to the advancement of the civilization, but to that original force of the sin which hides in the heart of man, and from which proceed all evil and corruption individual and social.

A complex civilization, such as is ours, affords the field and the opportunity for sin's darkest and bloodiest deeds.

The most desperate state of any society is caused by its ignorance of the real forces that make for its redemption. The question of primary importance at last comes to be this—where shall society find its reservoir of moral power that will keep it from spiritual bankruptcy, and provide a warrant against a disastrous catastrophe.

If we are wise in our own time and place we shall not try to promote righteousness by means of conventional devices rather than by the gracious resources provided by Him who said, "My kingdom is not of this world," nor by identifying Christianity with any ideas and schemes of social and economic reform. The motive force for every aspect of correct living lies deeper.

Horace Bushnell once said that "the soul of all improvement is the improvement of the soul." To get a man's soul right with God; to get the soul of society right with God that is the way of getting everything else right in this world. The Church at

least, needs to adhere to its divinely assigned task of dealing with things, men, conditions and remedies at the center.

The writer may be permitted to reinforce what he has written by citing what has been effectively said by an English expert and scholar on the subject which we have been considering. In a recent book "Christianity and social Questions," one in a series under the general title, "Studies in Theology," the author, Dr. Cunningham says, "The Church indeed consists of men, each of whom as a citizen of an earthly kingdom is called upon to do his political duties, as well as his other duties in the name of the Lord Jesus. For ordinary purposes in ordinary life, it may be important, or even perhaps possible, for a man to distinguish that which is incumbent on him as a citizen of an earthly realm from that which is incumbent upon him as a child in the family of God. But the distinction is of vast importance in regard to those who are called to office and ministry in Christ's Church. The terms of their commission lay down the limits of what they are to do by Christ's authority; they have no commission to put the affairs of society right, or to eradicate the evils in this present naughty world. In the gospel of the grace of God, they have committed to them the supreme means of touching man personally and inspiring them with high but practical ideals. This is the grandest work to which any man can give himself; and it is a miserable thing if he fails to put his best energies into this task, and prefers instead to compete with journalists and politicians in guiding some project for social reform. It is to forsake the fountain of life and to strain at accomplishing some apparent improvement by taking up implements that are less certain and less effective, even for securing human welfare, than the means of grace instituted by Christ himself. In his official capacity as called to preach the gospel of Christ, the minister is bound to set forth that which is good and to strive personally to attract man. The Old Testament prophetic office, with its denunciations of evil doers survived in John the Baptist's time, and his bold rebuking of vice; but it is at all events a very subordinate part of the preacher's duty and one which is not to be discharged in a wholesale fashion, without serious risk of alienating those whom it might have been possible to win. It is needful to look to the terms of Christ's commission both as to the duties that are to be done and the manner of doing them. He

sent His apostles on evangelistic work and bade them administer the sacraments and exercise pastoral care; but He did not enjoin them to agitate for social reforms."

If this testimony means anything for us it means this, that the minister of religion is not to permit himself to become perverted from the right ways of God into a mere reformer and social agitator, that he is to continue to be an ambassador to proclaim a gospel of regeneration rather than a mere propagandist of reformatory measures. To revert to the thought, with which I began, the greatest interest on this earth at this or any other time is religion, both for the individual and for the social state. Bernard Shaw recently made the astounding declaration, "Christ is a failure and God has been kicked out of the back-window in our modern age." It is said that this blasphemous and shocking utterance was designed to startle the audience. It likely did not fail of the end sought, for even the fact that such an utterance was even possible is enough to quicken some grave apprehensions. There is just enough in some of the aspects of contemplated reformatory programs and suggested panaceas for social ailments to suggest the apostle's phrase, "having no hope and without God in the world," together with a sentence from the late Prof. Bowen's "Lowell Lectures on Metaphysics and Ethical Science," viz., that "the civilization which is not based upon Christianity is big with the elements of its own destruction."

The one commanding and fundamental need of the age, not speaking in any restricted or particularistic use of the word, is a revival of religion, a quickening and realization of men's consciousness of God and their need of God. This is the primary need of our age not only that individual men and women may be saved from sin, but also that the great interests of humanity may not retrograde and humanity itself become hopelessly engulfed in its own baseness, vice, misfortune, abandonment and misery.

*Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE II.

PRINCIPLES OF THEOLOGY.<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR HENRY E. JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.

## DOGMATIC METHOD.

Dogmatic Theology is the science that discusses the underlying principles of Christianity as contained in its distinctive doctrines. The term "dogma," frequently used in Greek to designate a decree of a ruler or a resolution of a deliberative body, was appropriated by the philosophers in the sense of "a principle." Without abandoning, therefore, the familiar definition that "a dogma is a definition of doctrine formulated by Church authority," we may, nevertheless, for the sake of simplicity, consider it as "a principle."

We may help ourselves to a clearer meaning of what it implies by analyzing "dogma" into three elements. Its contents are, with us, some topic belonging to the Christian faith, viz., a revealed truth found in the Holy Scriptures. This first element of a dogma determines absolutely its material. If the first element is thus material, the second and third are formal. The occasion for the formulation of a dogma is always determined by historical circumstances. The Church in its progressive appropriation of the revealed truths contained in Holy Scripture, has been led, from time to time, to embody a summary of the results in settled and fixed forms, by certain questions that have deeply agitated its members, and called for its confession. Thus the second element is the historical. But in expressing its conclusions, its terminology is necessarily that of the philosophy of the time. The third element is, therefore, the philosophical.

All this may be embodied in a full definition: "A dogma is a statement of truth, drawn from the Holy Scriptures, as confessed by the Church, and expressed in terms current in the science of the time." The definition, of course, treats of the ideal dogma. For there are dogmas that neither are nor claim to be drawn from

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted from *The Lutheran Church Review*, for Jan. 1914, by permission.

Scripture. The dogmas of Rome, for example, make no pretext of being of exclusive Scriptural origin. That the dogma has been made by Church authority, is with her sufficient. Both the Scriptural and the historical elements of dogma entirely vanish. There are tendencies also at the other extreme, such as those that would introduce the authority of reason, or that of Christian experience, as sources of the dogmatic material. Not Holy Scripture, but the Christian consciousness, is made the subject of study, and the basis of generalization. The very term "*Glaubenslehre*," contains a reminiscence of this method. There are those who so depreciate the historical element, that they would like to reconstruct dogma by immediately and independently recasting Scriptural truth into modern molds, or would be content with showing the harmony between the source and its results, without taking the pains to become familiar with the process by which the results have been reached. Others overlook the fact that "dogma" is not an individual and arbitrary definition, but that it belongs to a community, and is official. It is the direct contradiction of that which is ordinarily termed "dogma," and reprobated as "dogmatic," viz., when one, in a very arrogant and self-opinionated manner, announces the acceptance of a statement for which he is unwilling to give reasons. Neither a mere individual opinion, nor even that of a school or party within the Church, can be called a "dogma." Then, there are still others, who would so emphasize the philosophical side of "dogma," as to minimize the Scriptural element, and to teach, in a destructive and critical spirit, that the Church's dogmas are nothing but philosophical propositions—and that, too, propositions belonging to a form of philosophical thought that has long been obsolete. Thus we are told by an eminent living writer that, while Gnosticism was indeed an attempt to adulterate Christianity by an "acute hellenizing" process, which the Early Church had strength enough to repel, yet that in the Nicene theology, there is a "subtle hellenizing" element, that has more or less pervaded all later Christianity. There is all the difference in the world, however, between drawing upon philosophy for the accurate formulation of our statements, and adopting purely speculative data as their substance. The definitions stand, reflecting in their phraseology the philosophy of the times in which they were framed, while the truth which they embody is trans-

latable into the language of each generation as time advances.

#### I. THE SCRIPTURAL ELEMENT.

Let us consider each of these elements somewhat more fully. The Holy Scriptures, we have said, is the source of all the religious truth given to the Church for it to teach. This does not imply that we have in the Holy Scriptures simply a great store-house of material upon which the Church is to draw in just any way. It does not mean that by means of parallel references, or by the diligent use of a concordance, we are to accumulate a number of passages, and then at once to arrange and adjust them so as to form a judgment concerning the harmony of their teaching. The Bible is not a mere treasure-house of texts, to be drawn upon, as one may desire, whether for dogmatical or homiletical purposes. The Holy Scriptures constitute an organism, in which part fits into part most accurately; no bone, or sinew or organ of our bodies can perform its functions, if transferred to another part of the body. The Holy Scripture cannot be understood in each part, unless they be studied as a whole; neither can they be understood as a whole, unless they be studied individually and independently. A passage of Scripture torn from its context may be anything else than a word of God. The immediate context teaches much; the place which a passage holds in a particular book teaches more; and this becomes all the clearer when the place of the particular book in which the passage occurs is considered in its relation to the entire structure of Scripture.

Certain books of the Bible are extended treatises on particular topics which are elaborately treated, and with reference to which there are occasional condensed statements summing up the entire argument. Such, for example, is the Epistle to the Romans, concerning the Universalism of Christianity and Justification by Faith; the Epistle to the Galatians, concerning the relation of Law and Gospel; the Epistle to the Hebrews, concerning the relation of Judaism to Christianity, the Finality of Revelation in Christ, and Christ's Eternal Priesthood; and the Epistle to the Philippians on the States of Humiliation and Exaltation. Such discussions become normative of the meaning of all Scripture. All incidental allusions are interpreted by those portions



of Scripture which professedly and at length treat of the same subject. We take them as the foundation, and apply the principle of the Analogy of Faith, i. e. the principle of the harmony and self-consistency of Scripture when rightly interpreted.

The Key and interpreter of all Scripture is Christ. He is at once the culmination of all revelation, and the final and complete revealer. The "divers portions" and "divers manners," in which God spoke, under the Old Testament, by the prophets, are contrasted with the revelation made, once and for all, in Jesus Christ, Heb. 1:1, 2. The argument is that the latter alone is clear and adequate. We begin, therefore, the study of Scripture with the study of those portions of Scripture which report the life and words and works of Jesus; and from them, we proceed, next, to the Pauline writings that explain fully why it was that Jesus came. When we give our children, as soon as they can read, their own copies of the New Testament, we show that this is the order which is suggested by the necessities of the Christian life. When, however devoted we may be to the whole Bible, we carry with us on our journeys a New Testament, often with the Book of Psalms attached, we are under the same impression. So, too, when the lessons appointed to be read in our churches, the Gospels and Epistles, come from the same portion of the Holy Book, they show that this practice is nothing new, but has been that of the Christian Church almost ever since there has been a New Testament. In the days of the Reformation, Luther in German, and Tyndale in English, translated and published the New Testament before they applied themselves to the Old. Into every new language into which missionaries translate the gospel to-day, the same rule is followed. The order always has been from the knowledge of the New Testament, into that of the Old. To us who live in the Christian dispensation, the New Testament always comes first. The Old Testament furnishes the historical background, and the record of the earlier "partial" revelations, as they are termed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that preceded and foreshadowed the single and complete revelation of the Incarnate Word. But the New Testament is more than the simple natural development or evolution of what is contained in the Old. For there is a new and supernatural interruption of the order even of that which had been supernaturally given, by the entrance of Christ and Christianity into the world; so that the second dif-

fers from the first stage of revelation not only in degree, but also in kind.

In order, then, to follow a correct dogmatical method, the foundations must be laid in the study of the New Testament. One cannot be a dogmatician in the truest sense of the word, unless he have first been an exegete, and have proceeded from New Testament Exegesis to New Testament Theology, whose office it is to unfold the progress of doctrine, and thus to interpret each passage by its place in the unfolding of God's revelation. Nor can the topics of New Testament Theology be adequately known unless there be some apprehension of the points of contrast with, and progress beyond, the treatment of the same themes in the Old Testament. The latter is, therefore, a valuable auxiliary to the former. Old Testament Theology must in fact be always dependent upon the New; for it is only when Christ takes the Old Testament into His hands, and "beginning at Moses and all the prophets, expounds in all the Scriptures the things concerning Himself," that the Old Testament can be understood. Luke 24:27.

## 2. THE HISTORICAL ELEMENT.

The historical element in dogma also calls for prominent consideration. God's revelation in Christ, although adequate and complete, is too extensive and rich to be apprehended except very partially by anyone individual or age. In the Holy Scriptures, there is a mine of truth that is absolutely inexhaustible. Every man and every generation may draw from its stores, and yet, with every new effort, what is new and fresh is discovered. During the few years of Christ's ministry, as he walked visibly among men, all that He had for man's saving knowledge, was already proclaimed. But the Church has attained a consciousness of this, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, only by a gradual process. The age next to the Apostles, instead of being one especially favored with the clear perception of the truth, was one only of infancy. An age of great faith is not necessarily one of great understanding as to the contents of that faith. Centuries had to intervene before the New Testament, as we now have it, was the common property of the Church. The life of believers was nourished largely through the oral tradition of the

works and words of Christ. The New Testament books came gradually. Even the Old Testament was only written, not printed. Fifteen centuries had to intervene before the art of printing placed the priceless Scriptures into every man's hand, and rendered them accessible at all times. Nor were the first Christians more than very humble, but practical men, thoroughly occupied with maintaining the life of Christianity against the attacks of the world around them. They knew the great facts of Christianity, but were without the learning of the schools. But soon enough, the time came when Christianity won for itself adherents among the trained thinkers and scholars of the ancient world, who sought to systematize the saving truths which they had embraced, and to trace their relations to **what they had** learned elsewhere. A series of inner conflicts driving Christians to the Scriptures for a solution of their problems, resulted gradually in the growing of definitions, to most clearly express what is truly Christian, and to separate it sharply from other theories, that had, on the mere surface, much resemblance to Christianity. When Gnosticism attempted to use the truths of Christianity for the purposes of its philosophy, the Church was forced to give philosophy due recognition, and employ it as the servant, instead of bowing before it, as the mistress of faith. It was used for the arrangement of material, and the definition of terms, but was not permitted to dominate theology. This was only the beginning of a process, the tracing of which occupies the science of the History of Dogmas. The unfolding of dogma passes through three great periods, the Pre-Augustinian, the Augustinian and the Lutheran; the first marked by the attempts to apply the philosophy of the Graeco-Roman world to the truths of Scripture; the second, characterized in its great leader and teacher by a destructive and critical process, as the results of the preceding period were tested by a more thorough acquaintance and a deeper study of the writings of St. Paul, and by a constructive process defining clearly the limits of reason and affirming the supremacy of faith, that was interrupted by the downfall of the Ancient World, the stupendous task of the conversion of rude races, and the recrudescence of a false philosophy; and the third, distinguished by a return to Augustine's incomplete work, and, through Augustine, to Paul who, never in all the history of the Church, had been apprehended, as the real interpreter of the

life of Christ and the meaning of Scripture, as he was by Luther. Luther was strong simply because he was imbued most thoroughly with the theology of St. Paul. In vain do we search in the Post-Apostolic era for any approach to such appreciation and appropriation of what Paul had taught. We recur to the Sixteenth Century, not because then the dogmatic process was final and closed, but because we retrace our steps from periods of deterioration, as Luther did when he turned from the Scholastics to Augustine, in order, upon the basis of a Pauline interpretation of Scripture truth, to be ready for any further advance, the Church may be called upon to make, as questions heretofore unsolved may meet her.

### 3. THE PHILOSOPHICAL ELEMENT.

Now as to the third element. If a decision reached by the Church is to have permanent value, it must be stated in clear, precise and exact words. The value of technical terms lies in the fact that, in compressed and compact form, they express what is otherwise most widely scattered. They enable us, by a process of generalization, to declare in briefest language the results of long and wide examination. To avoid their use, is nothing more than to decline to come to a conclusion as to a subject of investigation. It is a plea for mere vague and indefinite thought. There is no department of human knowledge without its terminology. This terminology is always affected by the general scientific thought of the time. The general process of reducing to unity whatever knowledge is possessed must necessarily influence every special department of thought; and theology can be no exception. It must have non-Scriptural terms, in order to bring together and to hold fast and together truths found by comparing Scripture with Scripture, and thus treating Scripture, as one organic whole.

Controversies concerning dogma may be traced to a misunderstanding as to what dogma is, or to defects with respect to either the Scriptural, the historical or the philosophical element in the dogma. Holy Scripture may be ignored or be incorrectly used. History may be entirely passed by, or, as in the so-called pragmatic method, be given too much prominence. Philosophy may be allowed to be determinative or may be misapplied. There

have been controversies where the entire contention has been not concerning the subject considered, but only concerning the applicability to it of certain terms, used by the antagonists in varying senses. Scripture itself has a name for such discussions. It calls them "logomachies." 1 Tim. 6:4; 2 Tim. 2:14.

The relation of the philosophical to the Scriptural element, is to be decided in a given case, not only by the fundamental principle that Scripture alone should furnish the material of a dogma, and that the only office of philosophy is to determine its expression, but also by an historical sense that enters into the study of the circumstances under which the dogma was framed and has been maintained. Historical conditions and circumstances explain the axiom: *quum duo idem dicunt, non est idem.*

*Mt. Airy, Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

WHY MUST WE HOLD FAST TO THE CONFESSION?<sup>1</sup>

BY PROFESSOR THEODORE ZAHN, OF ERLANGEN.

The question which I have been charged to answer before you is not whether we *wish* to hold fast to our Confession. The continued existence of the General Lutheran Conference and our meeting here under this name clearly show how our purpose, namely, that all church bodies in which the Gospel, restored by Luther and his associates, still stands forth as the acknowledged doctrine, may continue to hold this doctrine as the confession of their faith and the bond of unity among them. The purport of the question, with which we must occupy our minds to-day, is rather, *Why must* we hold fast to our Confession? Even before we answer this question, indeed by the mere fact that we have raised it, we indicate how serious a matter it is to hold fast to our Confession. It is not a fondness for the old; not an idle clinging to the customary; not an unwillingness to help in the development of theological knowledge; and not a failure to recognize the value of evangelical freedom. But it is a necessity grounded in the nature of the things with which we are dealing, and therefore it is our duty. We *wish* to hold fast to our Confession because we *must* do so, because we cannot do otherwise. It is a matter of great importance to-day that those, whose hearts cherish a deep love for our faith and for the Church of our fathers, should have a clear idea of the reasons which make it a

1 This is a translation of a paper read by Professor Zahn at the fourteenth convention of the General Lutheran Conference which met at Nuremberg last September. Zahn is easily the Nestor among conservative scholars in the field of New Testament research. Near the very close of his seventy-fifth year when he made this address but at the very height of his intellectual vigor and his spiritual earnestness, he produced a profound impression upon his hearers. The staunch faith of this venerable scholar was refreshing and reassuring to the Conference and his stirring plea for the firm anchor of faith in the unstable waters of the present was regarded by many as the most impressive and stimulating of all the papers of the convention. The original of this article is found in the official report of "Die XIV. Allgemeine evangelisch-lutherische Konferenz vom. 8. bis 11. September 1913 zu Nürnberg." This translation was prepared by Mr. Carl C. Rasmussen of the Gettysburg Theological Seminary.

necessity and a duty for all—laymen and theologians, men and women—always to do their part to hold before us and our children a clear and significant statement of our faith. For within the Lutheran Church, as well as without, dissenting voices are raised, and they grow louder and louder. In the name of the modern development of science and culture, demands of various kinds and different degrees of insistence are made for a change in the relation of congregations and pastors to the Confession of the Church. Some seek to abolish all obligations binding the clergy to a fixed norm of doctrine. Others are endeavoring merely to replace the customary formulas by new ones of greater flexibility. Some wish to discard all compulsory use of the traditional liturgical formulas in baptism, confirmation and ordination. Others seek such changes in the services and instruction of the Church, as would virtually empty them of all content.

Hitherto the leaders of this movement in the Church have been chiefly theologians, pastors in the active service of the Church, and teachers. But these classes are now being reinforced by a strong stream from the ranks of the laity,—people who are not content to live entirely without religion and the Church, but who are no longer friendly to the doctrine and liturgy of the Church. The justifiable aversion to all compulsion in matters of faith and of God's service, the charming sound of the expression "Christian Liberty," and not least of all, the fear of appearing reactionary, exercise a powerful influence especially on the younger theologians.

And who is there who does not have sympathy for the young men to whom their teachers, in many cases, have taught a destructive criticism of the Church's doctrine and of the Bible! They suddenly find themselves face to face with the duties of the ministry, before they have had time for independent thinking, for delving into the Scriptures and the history of the Church, and for putting the new and old doctrines to the test of actual experience. Young theologians really have greater difficulty in finding the right path to-day than we had fifty years ago. But in spite of the fact that there are unusual difficulties peculiar to our own times, which ought to make us mild in our judgments of individuals who err and stray away, nevertheless this should not prevent us from holding fast to our Confession



and reminding ourselves now and then of the reasons which make it our duty to do so.

Now, the question is not primarily about the particular Confession of our Lutheran Church. For long before the Reformation, even before the very beginning of Christianity, Church and Confession were indissolubly bound together. He who desires to see preserved in our particular denomination something of that Church which Jesus Christ founded and to which he gave his promises, must make it his first consideration that in our Churches that old Confession, which was the immediate echo of Jesus' teaching and preaching, may retain its value. With that statement I have already begun to answer the question set before me.

#### THE CONFESSION IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

Jesus promised in unmistakable terms that after His departure from the visible world he would call into being a Church which would endure forever in spite of all opposition. This promise he made in reply to a confession which Peter one day made in the name of all the apostles. We do not allow ourselves to be prevented from appealing to this promise, either by its misuse at the hands of the pretended successors of Peter at Rome, or by the supposedly infallible, yet groundless, dictum of criticism which explains this promise as a fiction of later date. When Jesus said to Peter, "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my Church," He evidently did not refer to the ground upon which man should lay the foundation of his life. Such a rock of salvation is found only in God and in His gracious will, out of sinful and mortal man to establish a Church of righteous and immortal children of God. Nor is Peter the corner-stone which completes the foundation and gives firmness to the whole house, with which Jesus compares his future Church. For according to the unanimous testimony of Jesus and His apostles, that corner-stone for all time is Jesus and Jesus alone. Peter is only one of the stones which, as he himself, speaking of all Christians, says in his first epistle, join themselves to Christ as living stones to the one living corner-stone of the house of God. The position as a first stone to which countless other stones would attach themselves, Jesus assigns to Peter only because he was the first one to

answer to the questions which the Lord had directed to all the apostles. He declared, "Thou art the Christ." Whether he said only this, or, as Matthew adds, "The son of the living God," it was at all events a confession, as significant as it was brief.

Up to that day not a few people had called Jesus Lord or Rabbi, as well as Son of David and Messiah, without receiving the seal of Jesus' approval upon such a confession. But Jesus proposed to distinguish between the faith which Peter confessed and the changing opinions of the people concerning Him. And He sought to bring the disciples to a consciousness of this difference when He first asked them what others said of Him, and then how they themselves regarded Him. The prevailing opinion was then and for some time afterwards, that Jesus was one of the prophets sent from God. His appearance reminded some of the ardent Elijah, and others of Jeremiah bemoaning the ruins of Jerusalem. Some held very superstitious ideas: that in Jesus the soul of Elijah had taken on flesh and blood for the second or third time; or that the executed John the Baptist had arisen from the dead to resume his interrupted life-work. Now, according to his own testimony and that of His first followers, Jesus was a great prophet. But to his disciples he had become more than a prophet and something different from a prophet. Nor did they look upon Him as one of those followers of David arising in great numbers at that time, who had perhaps been called to help the long dethroned house of David back to a position of royalty, only to give place after a few decades to a new heir. They recognized Him rather as the one and only Christ, who had long been promised, but had now been sent by God and anointed with the Spirit as King and Lord, the authorized restorer of God's people, whose kingdom embracing the world was to be the perfect realization of God's sovereignty over the world.

In this faith the disciples were secured against the narrow religious conceptions of the populace by the manner in which they arrived at their faith. For when Jesus pronounced Peter blessed, saying that that which He had confessed had not been revealed to Him by flesh or blood, but by the Heavenly Father, He thereby declared that the conviction, which Peter had expressed in his confession, originated neither in his own heart nor in that of any other man, but that it was the effect of the secret influence of God upon the heart of Peter and his fellow disciples.

But on the other hand this inner operation of God upon the soul of the individual, through which the secret of Jesus' person is revealed, is not a direct action like that which makes a man a prophet. Rather does this inner effect, to-day as in Peter's day, result from the influence of the inspiring and captivating word of Jesus. For shortly before his confession Peter had testified out of his own experience and the experience of the other disciples, when he said to Jesus, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life. And we believe and are sure that Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." (John 6:68, 69).

Now as a matter of fact, Jesus did not take as the theme of His preaching, "I am the Christ," or "I am the Son of God." Nor had He given this or any similar formula of confession to His disciples, which they were to repeat after him. Indeed he had even occasionally forbidden them to use this formula as a slogan among the masses. But He so preached the Gospel of the Kingdom of God, and so set forth the secrets contained in that Gospel, that they came to the conviction which we may express in almost the very words of Jesus: A greater than Jonas and all the prophets is here, a greater than Solomon and all the other sons of David. Here is the Son of Man, who is greater and holier than the Sabbath and the Temple. He is a King, it is true, as he was promised to Israel for the end of time. But he is also the Builder of a new Church, the Savior and Judge of all mankind. This is the faith to which God brought the first disciples through Jesus. And the confession of this faith became the bond of unity for the Christian Church, not only as Jesus wished, but also as he actually instituted it.

These are of course truths which men have called into question. It has been said that the gospel which Jesus Himself preached is essentially different from that preached by the apostles; and also that the faith of the Apostolic Church and of all later Christianity is different from that which Jesus taught His disciples. It is asserted that the gospel which Jesus proclaimed, had as its goal the establishing of God's kingdom, and Jesus is only the preacher, not the object, of the original gospel. On the other hand the gospel of the apostles, it is said, magnified the crucified and risen Christ into the primary object, and thus al-

lowed the thought of the kingdom of God to fall into the background.

The impossibility of this distinction between the gospel of Jesus and the gospel of the Apostolic Church follows from what I said above about the origin of the Apostolic Confession, which arose from Jesus' testimony concerning Himself and received His approval. A certain difference between Jesus' testimony concerning Himself and the manner in which the apostles and Christians of all times have spoken of Him, is only the evident consequence of his humility. He could not and would not preach about Himself and glorify Himself, but only His Heavenly Father. He often acknowledged that the witness which he might bear concerning Himself would be of very questionable value. He expressly refused to labor and to care for His own honor. He left it to the Father to give Him that honor which was due to Him. And for that very reason God had given to Him already in this world a name of unfading splendor and a glorious recognition in the Church, such as no other man ever received. In the light of these facts the difference between the self-witness of Jesus and the preaching of the apostles, out of which some wish to make a distinction of two gospels, simply corresponds to the word of Jesus, "What I tell you in the darkness, speak ye in the light; and what ye hear in the ear, proclaim upon the house-tops." (Matt. 10:27).

Moreover the gospel which Jesus preached underwent a material development from the time that he preached to the time that the apostles preached. And a similar change also took place from the faith and confession of the immediate disciples of Jesus to the faith and confession of later Christendom. But this was not due to the fact that another of greater logical power had eclipsed the plain preacher of Nazareth; nor to veneration of the founder or the devotion of the community that honored His memory and sought to exalt Him in word and song. But it was due to occurrences which had taken place in the meanwhile, especially to the resurrection of Jesus. If His disciples already had looked upon Him as the promised Christ, God now for the first time made him Lord and Christ in an indisputable manner. (Acts 2:36). The death on the cross, which had been to them a stumbling-block, in spite of all prophecies and proofs from the Scriptures, and had stood as an insuperable obstacle to their

faith, now appeared as the will of God and the necessary means for the completion of the work of redemption and the person of the Redeemer. The mention of the crucified Christ had provoked the Jews to opposition and the Greeks to ridicule. But now because the disciples could stand as witnesses to the resurrection of Jesus, they could preach this crucified Christ, both to the Jews and to the Gentiles, as the only Savior from sin and death.

However, this does not signify the exchanging of one gospel for another, but only the unfolding and enriching of the one, eternal gospel through new acts of divine revelation. Thus the apostles viewed the matter. When Paul occasionally speaks of his own gospel (Rom. 2:16; 16:25; II Tim. 2:8), he understands by that the gospel as it was preached to the Gentiles by himself and his fellow laborers, as distinguished from the gospel as the older apostles were called upon to preach it in the first place to the Jews. Nevertheless Paul knows only one true Gospel, which he sometimes calls the Gospel of God, and sometimes the Gospel of Christ. He places it on a par with the preaching of Jesus or the word and witness of Christ. There must have been a great difference between the manner of preaching the Gospel to the Jews and the manner of preaching it to the Gentiles. The divisions between the Jewish and the Gentile parts of Christianity must have been very serious. And yet so far as we know, there never occurred a difference of opinion between Paul and the older disciples, about the contents of the Gospel and a saving faith. We have only the evidence of complete mutual understanding as to the content of the evangelical proclamation. The churches all agreed upon a simple proclamation of the Gospel and doctrines of Christ.

The apostles thoroughly agreed in rejecting every effort to counterfeit the original gospel either through spurious additions or arbitrary subtractions from the text. How many such attempts had already in the life-time of the apostles endangered the unity and purity of the doctrines of Christianity! On the one side stood those Christians who had been reared in orthodox Judaism. They maintained that to be saved all Christians, including those of Gentile birth, must accept the Mosaic law and observe the Jewish manner of life. On the other side were Gentile Christians, in ever increasing numbers, who under the influence of former heathen practices and unchristian environment

not only failed to realize the seriousness of Christian manners and conduct, but also ignored essential doctrines of the Christian faith. But none of the apostles would lend his authority to any of these efforts at a substitute for the original Gospel. It is easy to understand why modern theologians have charged Paul and John with fanatical intolerance. For it was Paul who wrote: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema," (Gal. 1:8). And it was John who wrote: "Whosoever goeth onward and abideth not in the teaching of Christ, hath not God..... If anyone cometh unto you, and bringeth not this teaching, receive him not into your house, and give him no greeting" (II John 9, 10). Such words surely do not sound especially tolerant according to the modern view.

However, such directions were not useless. That attitude of mind served an important purpose. It was really the salvation of Christianity. For ancient Christianity had many dangers to face and many temptations to resist. Complete freedom of speech was given to every man in the congregation. No well-defined church polity bound the members into a compact organization. But in spite of these weaknesses, Christianity safely lived through all its dangers. It maintained itself as a benign brotherhood, united in faith and confession, and conquering the world. On the other hand the religious movements which deviated from the Gospel of Jesus and the apostles, always withered into small sects in a short time. This salvation of early Christianity was due in part to the decisiveness with which the apostles rejected all errors that sought protection under the claim of being Christian; and in part to the clear tones with which they constantly warned the churches to preserve the unity of the spirit and to avoid all quarrels and differences of opinion. They declared that the ground for such individual differences is not found in the faith of the heart but in human weaknesses and peculiarities. They are due to the differences in usage, taste, judgment, or personal preferences. Through all these difficulties God gave success to the apostles. They restored peace to more than one troubled congregation, and left a unified church. All the congregations joined in confessing the crucified and risen One, and in offering up their prayers to the Lord Jesus Christ. A glance at the apostolic age shows what power and protection

this confession afforded to the congregation. Those who were about to forsake the faith of the congregation or the basis of Christian unity did not venture to renounce openly their confession in the Lord Jesus Christ. Strange teachers, coming to Corinth, whom Paul judged as false apostles and servants of Satan, neither knew of nor dared to preach about any other Jesus than him of whom the genuine apostles spoke. (II Cor. 11:4, 13:15).

One after another of the eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses to the events of the gospel died. Then began the attempts to substitute a phantastic caricature for the genuine Christ as preached by the apostles. People arose in Corinth, who asserted that there is no resurrection of the dead. But they did not dare to say, and perhaps not even to think, that Jesus Himself had not arisen from the dead. Paul first had to show them that the denial of a general resurrection necessarily involved the denial of the resurrection of Jesus, and therefore the undermining of all Christian faith and hope. We ought not to picture the Churches of the apostolic age as more perfect or more holy than the New Testament will warrant. Certainly the extent of their knowledge left much to be desired in many, and perhaps in most, of the church members, as is the case to-day. There were also people who participated in the worship of Christ without sincerity of heart. That is to say there were hypocrites with whom the sincere Christian was not to make peace (II Tim. 2:22). But at that time these people were more quickly recognized than in later times, and they could not have been very numerous. It cost too much to be a Christian at that time. It was only in the rarest exception that temporal benefit resulted from the Christian Confession. If we view the whole situation we must look upon the Church of the apostles with veneration and thankfulness; and the contemplation of their difficulties, battles, and victories, only strengthens us in the conviction that if we seriously wish the Gospel and the Church of Christ to occupy a place in our life and activity, we must hold fast to our Confession, as did the apostles and their Churches.

#### THE CONFESSION AND THE CHURCH OF THE PRESENT.

Furthermore, an examination of the present condition of the Church can only strengthen us in this conviction, when we con-



sider the nature of Christianity and the nature of the Church. Christianity is not a religion of hermits, who take thought only for their own holiness and salvation: Nor is it a scholastic interpretation of God, the world, and the human soul, which may be appropriated by anyone to whom it seems clear. Christianity is by nature a religion of society. It is true that the Gospel comes to the individual, to set him at peace with God and to give him hope for eternal life. But everyone, whom it brings into the faith, it places in a new inner relationship to all mankind. For the saving grace of God, which that Gospel proclaims, is intended for all men. Therefore our faith brings with it the irresistible impulse to share it with those who do not yet have it, and to cultivate a community of fellowship among such as have attained unto the faith. This faith cannot even continue, much less progress, without the worship of God by the body of believers, without the training and education of the young, and without the exercise of love for the brethren and for all mankind in every condition of human necessity. These are three necessary expressions of the Christian faith. At least the first two, the common worship of God and the instruction of the young by the Church, demand for their proper observance a rich and clearly stated Confession of the faith of the congregation.

So far as divine worship is concerned, two of Jesus' words in particular seem to me to be especially important. The first is the word which He spoke to the Samaritan woman: "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth." (John 4:24). The worship must not consist of the mechanical repetition of fixed formulas. Through the impulse of the Holy Spirit it must ever be born anew in the heart of the worshipper. In all its forms worship must be a true expression of a humble longing for God and His help, and of joy at His mercy. This is true, no matter whether we use a fixed prayer, as the Lord's Prayer, or a free prayer springing from the heart of the suppliant. The second word of Jesus, to which I refer, is taken from the conclusion of a discourse in which the Lord for a second time spoke of His future Church. "Where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them." (Matt. 18:15-20). The name of Jesus, which is here designated as the bond of unity in the communion assembled in prayer, is nothing else than Jesus Himself, who has become the

content of the Confession. The Church must be united in faith in Jesus as He is preached through the Gospel, and it must also be united in Confession. Otherwise it cannot claim the great promise that Jesus Himself with His Spirit and gifts will be present in reality and in power.

Now, how do we stand with respect to worship and religious instruction, when we measure ourselves by these two words of Jesus? Our churches still have a publicly acknowledged Confession of distinctly Christian and Evangelical Lutheran character. It is true that comparatively few of the members of our churches are familiar with the symbolical writings of our particular Church. Nevertheless the essential content of these symbols is impressed upon the hearts, and even upon the lips, of our church members from youth up, through such agencies as Luther's catechism, the forms and formularies of the weekly worship, the festivals of the Church Year, baptism and confirmation, confession and communion, and not least of all through our splendid collection of Church Hymns of all ages and all branches of the Christian Church. Then too, in all Churches of the Lutheran Confession, even in those State Churches in which the confessional basis has lost in clearness through the Prussian Union, there is still some form of obligation binding the clergy to exercise their office in accord with the Church's Confession.

But it is equally clear that in the same church bodies an increasing number of theologians have in their own hearts broken away from the inherited Confession of the Churches committed to their charge. To be sure, there are pronounced differences between these theologians. They differ in the degree of their reverence for the past and in the carefulness with which they express their new views, and also in their regard for that which God has given us through Christ. On the one hand we find those who openly deny the testimony of the Scripture and the Confession of the Church. On the other hand are those, some of whom silently avoid the clearest witness of Jesus and its reflection in the Confession, while others translate them into confused ideas and vague feelings. It is by no means certain that the former class is guilty of greater harm to the Church than the latter. One thing, however, is beyond doubt. The attitude of not a few ministers towards the Confession makes impossible a truly Christian service, a common worship of God in spirit and

in truth. And this fact becomes more evident as the forms of worship are more highly developed. In many places it is customary for the minister each Sunday to call upon the congregation to repeat with him the Apostles' Creed, either in spirit or by word of mouth. In this practice we find the possibility of an intolerable falsehood. Some of the clergy look upon the gospel account of the birth of Jesus as a fable, and view the experience of more than five hundred disciples, upon which our faith in the resurrection of Jesus depends, as an illusion without foundation in fact. And yet with the words, "I believe," such ministers introduce a series of propositions, which, for the most part their own convictions compel them to deny. And even where the Apostles' Creed is not used as a Confession in every service, the same practice is found in connection with baptism and confirmation. But above all, our growing young people have the Apostles' Creed with Luther's exposition of it in their catechisms. It is inconceivable to me, as to many others, how a teacher of religion holding such views as I have sketched, accomplishes his purpose, unless he is satisfied to let his pupils chatter about a formula that they do not understand, and does not really seek to lead them into a living understanding and believing appropriation of the symbol. And we have reason to believe that the new science of the psychology of religion will not be able to solve this riddle.

And even if the Apostles' Creed together with Luther's catechism should be rejected as out of date, there would still remain our Church Hymns, with which no Protestant worship can dispense. And there would also remain the festivals of the Church, which we celebrate with all Christendom. In the joyful hymns of these occasions, all Churches join in celebrating the festal times. Some preachers have a practice in connection with these festivals, and unfortunately the practice is growing, of using less of the Scriptures than of their own ideas, be they wise or foolish. This makes it easier for the preacher to ignore the real significance of these festivals, if he so desires. For the hymns and the Scripture for the day, in themselves, express our common faith. But, on the other hand, the modern evangelists and the modern prophets would scarcely find in our hymn-books any Christmas or Easter hymns that would give anything like an adequate expression of their faith. In what an unfortunate situation these

preachers must find themselves at the administration of the sacraments, if they believe their teachers who say that the Great Commission is no more historical than the other words and deeds of the resurrected Christ, but that these have all sprung from the credulous imagination of the Church, and that Jesus instituted neither the Lord's Supper nor Baptism as a sacrament. Let me ask a question. If Jesus did not institute these sacraments, does that not mean the overthrow of every promise and every assurance of the blessing that is linked with these practices?

Furthermore, our sacramental commemoration of God's works for our redemption and all our praise of the Redeemer in church worship presupposes the recognition and confession of our sinfulness. That is why the confession of sin has hitherto maintained its place, not only in the preparatory service, but also in the weekly services. One of the preachers of the United Church of Prussia, who has since demitted the ministry, made the expression last year that this weekly confession of sins "goes against the grain" with most of his congregation. A Bavarian pastor recently specified a number of elements in the Bavarian liturgy, which he regarded as impossible for the critical theologian. Among these he mentioned "the entire form of the confession of sin with its 'Christ have mercy upon us.'" That there is a contradiction between the positions of these critics and the prescribed order of service is evident. But the basis for this contradiction may not be clear. It may lie in an unwillingness earnestly to call upon the Lord Jesus for mercy and help, and to acknowledge Him as the living guarantee and mediator of God's mercy. Or it may lie in an unwillingness to agree with the teaching of Jesus. In the Lord's Prayer He taught His disciples to pray, "Forgive us our trespasses"; and in the parable of the pharisee and the publican He showed which of these two exemplified prayer that is acceptable to God. Jesus seems to know nothing of a third class. For there are only two classes in the house of the Lord. A man will be either as the pharisee, who pleases himself, or as the publican, who pleases God by the confession of his sins.

For him who uses such confessions with an inward unwillingness, it is no excuse to say that many church members hold the same position although they are free from the direct influence of the critics. For, without question, the responsibility of the

minister who prays and confesses in the name of the congregation is incomparably greater than that of the rest of the worshippers. When the leader of the worship says, "Let us pray," or "Confess with me," provided he himself enters sincerely into the prayer or the confession to which he invites the congregation, he remains within the bounds of truth and consistency, even though he knows that by no means all of those present really join with him in praying, singing, or confessing. Our Churches are open to all. The baptized Gentile and the unbaptized Jew, the Catholic and the sectarian are all heartily welcome as guests in our places of worship. No one requires of them that they join with us in our prayers and hymns, either in mind or in spirit. Nevertheless it is not merely an artful abstraction when the preacher gives from the altar the invitation to prayer and confession. For he may well suppose that there will always be at least two or three present, who pray and confess out of an upright heart. And then he may trust in the promise that, no matter how small the circle may be, the Lord will manifest His presence there. He has but to do His work, not as a dead lip-service, but as a holy service performed in the spirit of devotion. If he has done that he has taken care, as far as he is concerned, that our service is a worship of God in spirit and in truth. That such is true only to a limited extent in our worship, is an open secret. And it is a condition that cannot long be endured.

#### EFFORTS AT ADJUSTMENT FOR TO-DAY.

Many have felt this, and many expedients have been proposed for the purpose of renewing true worship and restoring peace between the conflicting religious and theological elements within the Evangelical Churches. Some have demanded the removal of a compulsory liturgy, especially of the required use of the Apostles' Creed in the weekly services. They suggest the providing of parallel forms for baptism and confirmation, which may be used according to the choice of the individual congregations or the individual pastors. It seems that it is not always clear to them how intimately the growth of all our forms of worship is connected with the Confession of primitive Christianity and of the Reformation. Let me refer to the Church Hymn once more. There are some who maintain that in the song books

which have been published in the last sixty or seventy years, very few real hymns are to be found which even in a measure express their faith. And yet even they would not care to return to the time of the Enlightenment and the older Rationalism, when those who produced and those who improved songs were marked by their utter lack of taste. We have tested the hymns which we now use and found them a most excellent means of edification. Hence we could hardly forsake them for the still unwritten songs of a new faith. This would be out of the question even if poets should arise, the rhythm and force of whose songs could be compared even remotely with the songs of a Luther, a Paul Gerhardt, or many later poets whose hymns have found their way into our books. Even great mutual indulgence would not make it possible for those who differ in their views of Christ, to reach the goal which Paul set up for a mixed city congregation: "that with one accord ye may with one mouth glorify the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Rom. 15:6).

In this connection men have frequently sought to accomplish two specific ends. On the one hand, without formally abolishing it, they have sought to moderate the obligation of the clergy to the Confession as it has hitherto been received in the larger Church bodies. On the other hand, they have sought at the same time to preserve the unity and purity of doctrine. The first Prussian General Synod was held in 1846. C. J. Nitzsch, whom I highly esteem to this day as one of my teachers, spoke to that body. With the twofold purpose just mentioned, he placed before them a carefully considered proposition "partly, and indeed pre-eminently, out of consideration for the Union, not yet fulfilled, nevertheless real and ever increasing; and partly out of consideration for a theological position which made it impossible for some men entirely to agree with the symbolical books, even though they had an honest belief in the Gospel." His suggestion was that a distinction should be made between the ordination vow, which bestows the right to the clerical office in the whole State Church, and a doctrinal obligation imposed by the individual congregation. The latter might vary according to the confessional character of the particular congregation. But the ordination vow ought to embrace the following points: (1) a general reference to the authoritative significance of the Word of God in the Bible and to the confessions of Christianity in general; (2)

a Confession of faith following in the main the Apostles' Creed, yet with some points left out and others implied rather than expressed; (3) a vow to teach, in an evangelical spirit, that repentance, faith, and love are the way to righteousness and salvation. To these also should be added a system of instruction, not yet introduced into our Church polity.

By a majority of three to one, the Synod passed the motion, but it has never been put into execution. From the very beginning it was treated as a joke. This failure can hardly be explained by the political revolution of the time that followed. It was due rather to the artificial construction of that creed, and especially to the unnatural coupling of a double purpose, first, to unite the chief Protestant denominations, and, secondly, to harmonize the various elements in modern theology.

This suggestion would have simplified matters very much. But recent developments in Hamburg have made them still simpler. For a long time unfortunate conditions, in increasing number, have seemed to call into question the stability of the Lutheran Church of Hamburg. These conditions reached their climax in the beginning of the year 1912, through the appointment of Pastor Heydorn to a charge in Hamburg. This man set forth, not 95, but 100 theses, that he might surpass Luther's famous theses in number also. In these theses he openly attacked all the fundamental doctrines of the gospel and of every Christian Church. On Dec. 19th of the same year, a new ordination vow was adopted by action of the Hamburg Synod. It reads as follows: "I promise that as a true servant of the Evangelical Lutheran Church I will preach the Gospel according to the divine revelation in the Bible and in faith in the free and saving grace of God through Jesus Christ." In comparison with the formula of obligation which has been used in Hamburg for the last forty years, this moderation of the earlier form distinguishes itself, not only by its remarkable brevity, but also by its notable meagerness. The formula of 1912 is lacking in several features that are embodied in that of 1872: first, all mention of any Confession, especially of the Augsburg Confession; secondly, all admonition as to the duty to care for "the original clearness and purity" of the preached Word of God; thirdly, the obligation not only "to freely confess all the teachings of the gospel, instead of distorting or denying them and preaching errors or doubtful interpre-



tations, but also to resist all errors that contradict the Word of God." Instead of this the new formula contains a confession of the so-called formal and material principle of Protestantism, propositions which every Christian who believes in the Bible, whether Reformed, Methodist, or Baptist, will confess with us.

If we examine this vow in the light of the events which preceded it in the Church life of Hamburg, it hardly appears credible that the new formula was constructed with the purpose of preserving the hitherto Lutheran Church in Hamburg in her faith, and of preventing in the future the appointment of men like Heydorn to the clerical office. By reason of its meagerness it is much less fitted for that than the earlier formula. What, then, is the purpose of the change? The old formula which bound a man "as a true servant of God and of His revealed Word, to care for the purity of the same," did not prevent him from doing exactly the opposite of that which is here prescribed. Neither will the vow "to preach the gospel as a true servant of the Evangelical Lutheran Church" hinder him from preaching another gospel that is neither Lutheran, nor Evangelical, nor Christian. Let us take into consideration the speeches which were made before Synod on behalf of the new formula, and by which it was carried to victory. Then we see its evident purpose and the purpose which it was intended to fulfill by those who supported it. And this purpose, we find, was to substitute in the place of a distinct Confession, a formula which anyone of the present time, who calls himself a Christian and a Protestant, may interpret and adapt to suit his own taste.

The book from which I have obtained this formula, the argument advanced in support of it, and the proceedings of Synod, bears the title, "At the Death-bed of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in Hamburg." That is a severe judgment, but I do not venture to contradict it. For a church body which renounces its good Confession, as the Synod of Hamburg did last year, raises a doubt concerning its character, not only as a Lutheran, but even as a Christian Church. When absolute freedom of doctrine is granted to the clergy, we subject the Church to the whim of the clergy and establish the worst sort of popery. Freedom without regulation makes a house of disorder out of any human community. And this house of disorder is first led astray by demagogues, and then brought into bondage by despots. We

demand a regulation which shall especially bind all preachers and teachers of religion in order that the unabridged Gospel may continue its liberating operation in the heart of every church member. In our worship the clergyman alone has the floor. The attendant upon the church services must endure everything that the preacher pours down from the pulpit upon his hearers. No one has the opportunity to contradict it. If the preacher does not feel in conscience bound by the recognized Confession of the Church and especially by his duty to preach the Word of God, rather than his own ideas, the hearer is at his mercy. He must patiently endure some things that ought not to go unchallenged in a Christian Church.

The reply is made that the majority of people do not notice any difference in the preaching. And it is said that the more cultured classes of the people are favorably disposed towards preaching that has cut loose as much as possible from the shackles of custom and fitted itself to the advance of modern times. The only requirement is that the preaching be done with enthusiasm and some display of rhetoric. And unfortunately we must confess that this is all too true. This lack of spiritual discernment in our congregations is simply an indication of a serious defect in our method of preaching and in our religious instruction, especially in the higher schools. Nevertheless the condition is not so bad as it might appear, among our really enlightened people; and people like ourselves would also belong to the congregations of those seeking edification. When I go to church on Sunday I am not seeking instruction primarily, but I seek a quickening of my faith, the strengthening of the consciousness that I belong to the Church of those who are redeemed by Christ, and I look for encouragement in the exercise of my faith through the works of love. If the preaching is poor, I seek to govern myself, to ponder the text and participate with even greater gratitude in the prayer and singing of the congregation.

But there is one thing to which I cannot listen in calmness, and that is the preaching which veils the eternal truth of the Gospel in flowery language, or busies itself with propounding questions, or actually denies the truth. I have already had painful experiences in this respect, and the slightest fear that these experiences will be repeated prevents me from entering devo-

tionally into the service. How could we allow our children and grandchildren to receive instruction at the hands of a preacher who gives us no assurance at all that he is anxious to lead them to an understanding of the unmutilated Gospel! Even the most strenuous vow cannot guarantee an absolutely effective protection for the young and innocent against misleading doctrine. But the good Confession of our fathers is, and will continue to be, weighty evidence in that direction. And it is well calculated to awaken the sleeping consciences of teachers and of Churches. Therefore we hold fast to it.

#### CONFESSION AND MODERN RESEARCH.

Not infrequently our own individual right to hold fast to the Confession is denied on the ground that we ourselves are not in harmony with the Confession of the Church. It seems to me that the spirit of the times is not such as would lead anyone to court the honor of orthodoxy. The danger is much greater that they will seek to avoid the reproach which attaches itself to him who insists upon confessing the old and eternal Gospel. May God in His grace protect us from either weakness! He who gives his life to a historical and critical investigation of the beginning of Christianity and its literature, does not escape criticism. Frequently he must face the accusations which are brought by representatives of a science that pretends to be without presuppositions. They charge him with departing from the firm faith which the reformers had in the Bible. They say he has fallen away from the old Protestant doctrine of inspiration. But that which they so designate, is contained in no Lutheran Confession. It is nowhere set forth as the doctrine of our Church. Hence we do not allow their position because it is not in harmony with the actual facts of the Scriptures. But we heartily agree with the contention which the old dogmaticians set forth and sought to establish through this theory of inspiration. We believe with them that the Bible in its totality is a trustworthy record of divine revelation and a miracle of divine providence.

The criticism to which we subject the Bible, deals in part with large questions, but also to some extent with small points. As an example, we may mention the endeavor to restore the

original text of the New Testament. The completeness of the original record increases from decade to decade. With this work the reformers and the theologians of the succeeding centuries were not acquainted. This growing perfection not only holds out to us the means for such work, but also imposes upon us the duty of using those means. Thus we learn that not only single words and phrases, but even whole narratives, do not belong to the original records. Among such passages we may mention the conclusion of Mark's gospel (Mark 16:9-20), or the account of Jesus and the adulterous woman (John 8:1-11) and others. For centuries Christianity has used these passages. But the discovery that they are interpolations does not change our faith in the Bible. On the contrary, he who believes in the Father of Jesus, without whose knowledge not even a sparrow falls from the roof, cannot look upon it as a mere accident but as a work of divine providence that among these apocryphal additions there is not a single one which contradicts the genuine text or introduces an unhistorical fable about the deeds or words of Jesus. This is the more remarkable when we remember that so many such fables were produced during the first two centuries.

Without a doubt, Luther would have been amazed if he had heard that a theologian of the Church which bears his name, had questioned the genuineness of the historicity of the gospel of John. But a criticism which led to such a result, would not be an offense against our Confession. For, in distinction from other denominations, the Lutheran Church has established no limit to the Canon. And it is right that we have not forgotten the judgments of Luther, which depreciated some of the individual books of the New Testament and questioned the genuineness of others. I believe that the Fourth Gospel is a genuine work of the Apostle John and a specially important part of the Bible. But I do not believe this because I am compelled to do so by the Confession of a Church. That would paralyze my critical investigations. Rather am I convinced of the genuineness of John's gospel by two considerations: first, by the splendid historical proofs beginning with the twenty-first chapter, which was added to the rest of the gospel during John's life; and secondly, by the overwhelming impression that this book is the genuine testimony of an eye-witness.

But we critics are said to be in conflict with the Confession of

the Church, not only because of its tacit presuppositions, but also because of its express content. Moreover, it is claimed, we could repeat the Apostles' Creed as an expression of our faith, only with doubtful reservations and forced interpretations. The foolishness of such charges is evident. Any layman, who has been regularly instructed for confirmation and remembers a few fundamental facts, can refute them. But I should like briefly to point out one well-known historical example. This will show what consideration such accusations deserve. From the second to the twentieth century it has been objected by some well-meaning and educated people that the resurrection of the flesh is not only an intolerable position, but also contrary to the Scriptures, especially to Paul's statement that flesh and blood shall not inherit the kingdom of God. No proof is needed to show that the Jewish and New Testament use of the expression "flesh and blood" was quite common, to express the whole body and soul of man, *as he is by birth and nature*. If Paul had meant to teach that the resurrection of the flesh is impossible, his keen understanding would not have failed to see that by that expression he was forever excluding from the Kingdom of God all who are born of women. What he really implies in that statement (I Cor. 15:51-54) is rather that man's carnal nature must undergo a transformation to participate in the eternal Kingdom of God and Christ. A little before this, while speaking of the unity of the resurrection body with the present material body, he describes the differences in similies and metaphors. The substance, in which lies their unity in spite of all differences, he calls flesh (v. 39).

The conceptions of the apostles and their Church as to the bodily life of the resurrected, as far as it was possible to have conceptions of that which no one has seen (I Cor. 2:9), evidently grew out of the experiences which the disciples had during the days that followed after the resurrection of Jesus. For decades the Church must have heard essentially the same as we read in the gospels about the intercourse of the disciples with the risen Lord, for a considerable number of the living witnesses were right in their midst (I Cor. 15:3-7). More than once he himself called upon His disciples to convince themselves by sight and by touch that He had flesh and bones, and that He was not

a ghost or a disembodied spirit. On the other hand, He showed just as clearly that His body was not bound by the limits of space, and that it was entirely fitted for the use of His spirit. Then why would it be contrary to the Scriptures to speak of the resurrection of the flesh!

It was probably not without reason that in very early times Christians insisted that the ground of their hope was the resurrection of the flesh. For besides those who did not believe in any resurrection at all (I Cor. 15:12), there were already in the apostolic age persons bearing the Christian name, who maintained that the resurrection was already past (II Tim. 2:18). Such a view could only be held by placing an allegorical interpretation on the promise of the resurrection. This was done in various ways. Some said that the resurrection is the awakening of man to a new spiritual life by conversion and baptism. Others held that the promised resurrection is fulfilled by the separation of the soul from the body at death. Still others believed that man experiences resurrection through his children. As over against such wresting and distorting, the statement of the resurrection was a brief, yet striking, expression of the hope that was based on the words and the resurrection of Jesus. And it was just as scriptural as the confession of the appearance of Christ in the flesh, as was taught in opposition to all Docetic Christology. We hope for the renewal and the restoration of our entire bodily life, as formed by God Himself. This we believe. And why should we not. Christianity has confessed this same faith for eighteen centuries. Why should we forsake the words with which they uttered that Confession for so many years?

But we have made sufficient reply to those who would deprive us of our moral right to advocate the lasting value of the Confession of our Church. We are not frightened by the complaints that have been made against us. Some have charged that we are disturbing the peace of our Church, while others prophesy that we shall finally destroy it altogether. It is indeed sufficient cause for lament that among those, who with more or less justice bear the name of Christ, bitter strife has taken the place of harmony. It is doubly lamentable when it breaks out among the members of the same domination. But an honest fight is better than an unworthy peace. In the examples cited from life, I

have sought to show that such a false peace is the actual condition to-day in some of the Churches of the Lutheran Confession. Our fight against such conditions is nothing more than a necessary defense against assaults upon that which is indispensable to the continued existence of our Church.

We do not know what the outcome will be. It may be that, by force of numbers, we shall be driven out from the houses which, since the time of the Reformation, have served as places of worship for our companions in the faith. Such an event would surely be cause for great sorrow, especially when we remember that the misfortune would fall most heavily upon the shoulders of our people. But the defeated minority, fighting in the right, does not need to despair, if only it guards faithfully that which has been entrusted to it. The heavenly Father will not allow them to be in need of food and shelter. The promise is not given to the existing denominations that they shall continue for ever with their own peculiarities. And that means that that promise was not given to the State Churches or to the Free Churches of the Lutheran Confession. It was given only to the one Church, united in its confession of Jesus Christ. To this Church we render our Confession, with the Apostles' Creed as the basis of our faith and hope. We are obliged to believe it, for in its visible form many things are lacking in the Church. But we hope and are assured that it will become all that its Founder and Defender desires. No man is able to say who belongs to this Church, or who shall some day belong to it. But we do know this, that no man can class himself with that Church unless he faithfully guards and manifests in his life that which Christ has given to him in the knowledge of salvation through the serving of his Church. And therefore we must and will hold fast to our Evangelical Lutheran Confession.



## ARTICLE IV.

THE GENERAL SYNOD AND THE GENERAL COUNCIL  
IN HISTORY.

BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT.

Of every controversy there will arise two traditions, representing the two sides of the controversy. It becomes the function of the later historian to reconcile the two, or to show how they could arise in the minds of earnest and honest men. To reverse either tradition is not unfair, and it does not indicate disloyalty to the party whose tradition must be revised. At some time faithfulness to historical evidence will demand recognition, and will have its hearing. Whether that time has already come in the history of the relations within the General Synod which resulted in the organization of the General Council, may be a question.

In the following sketch, an attempt has been made to see only what the evidence demands and justifies. There is no prejudice intended to either side. Should it offend any one, the evidence must be consulted in refutation.

The tradition which is current not only in the General Council, but throughout the more strictly confessional portion of the Lutheran Church today, is well represented in the paragraph of Fritschel's *Geschichte der Lutherischen Kirche in Amerika*, II, 106: "A separation was inevitable. It was impossible that both tendencies should run parallel in peace and without disturbing one another. The Ministerium of Pennsylvania and other members as well had again approached more closely to the position of the founder; they had in part found their way back out of their errors. They could not permanently work with others who gave up the peculiarities of the Lutheran Church on principle, and placed her on a level with all the various sectarian Churches. These men were not yet ready especially for the practical carrying out of the Lutheran Confession, but they had good intentions; they called themselves Lutheran, and wanted to be Lutheran."

The formation of the General Council was inevitable, as a step

in the confessional history of the Lutheran Church in America. The historian may prophecy *ex eventu*. But it is a dangerous procedure. Certain things are inevitable only when we eliminate personal responsibility and allow events to unfold themselves through men, who are their tools. Or if we prefer, we may make men the tools of God, and ascribe all progress to Providence, and so again free men from all blame and from all praise. If progress is due to men, and men are to receive any credit, they must be responsible; and then definite events are inevitable only as men have made them so. It behooves us then to ask, what motives and what efforts of men made the separation of 1866 inevitable? Why could not the various elements within the General Synod work together within the same General Body?

It is strange that, when a historian writes that a certain separation was inevitable, he does not remember that he is using exactly the principle which gave rise to the Tübingen school. Because it was inevitable that principles must find expression in parties and parties must lead to separation, the men of the Apostolic Age who disagreed could not be made to agree in one Church. There must have been parties, and these parties by their growing apart and growing closer together again give the clue to the history. If the Tübingen theory of history is wrong, then any other theory on a different plane which uses the same presuppositions is equally wrong.

The case of the Reformation is different. There we have all the evidence, and, although there are two ways of accounting for the event, there are facts, and not theories of an inevitable separation, on both sides. Either as Protestants claim, Luther was put out of the Roman Church unfairly, or, as Roman Catholics claim, Luther protested against the Roman Church unfairly. The inevitableness of the separation lay not in principles but in definite actions of certain men, and these men must bear the praise or blame for adhering so strongly to the principles which they held.

We may assert then, that there was no absolute inevitability either for the separation of a Jewish Christianity from a heathen Christianity in the first century, nor for the separation of Protestantism from Roman Catholicism in the sixteenth century, nor for the separation of the General Council from the General Synod in the nineteenth century. In each case we must de-

termine the motives of the men who were responsible, and ascribe to them the responsibility for the separation.

With this need before us, let us look at the evidence as given in such a history as Fritschel's. When the Franckean Synod had been admitted to the General Synod, against the protest of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the General Synod modified its constitutional provision for the admission of synods, and that modification was accepted by the Pennsylvania Ministerium as promotive "of the unity and purity of our beloved Zion." Thus the difficulty raised on the question of confessional position was settled. But at the same time the Pennsylvania Ministerium reasserted the right, accorded its delegates on their admission in 1853, "to withdraw and report whenever a violation of the constitution would seem to occur." Jacobs, *History*, 461. The original question was one of the interpretation of the Constitution of the General Synod. The second was a question of the interpretation of this reserved right of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. The first difficulty was solved by the clearer formulation of the position of the Constitution. The second led to the formation of the General Council.

Upon the face of matters, it was the privilege of the General Synod to interpret its own Constitution, and also to interpret the agreement it had made with the Pennsylvania Ministerium upon the reception of its delegates in 1853. Both times however, the Pennsylvania Ministerium refused to accept the interpretation placed upon the Constitution and upon the agreement by the General Synod. Whatever confessional bearing its action may have had, must have been altogether in the back-ground, since it had first of all accepted the General Synod's position, and had endorsed that position as changed in 1864.

It was the confessional party which protested against the admission of the Franckean Synod, but was satisfied with the further action of the General Synod. It was the confessional party which protested against the General Synod's interpretation of the concession made to the delegates of the Pennsylvania Ministerium. But the question is generally overlooked, whether these protests arose in these quarters because they were involved in the confessional position of the men, or whether the confessional position was involved because these men made the protest? It may be impossible to distinguish clearly throughout; there are

indications, however, that the confessional position was not primarily involved.

When the Pennsylvania Ministerium returned to active fellowship with the General Synod in 1853 the confessional position was not seriously involved. The Pennsylvania Ministerium expressed a fear that efforts might be made within the General Synod to forsake the confessional position already held, and should such efforts be made, it reserved the right to protest. But before the crisis of 1866 the Ministerium had exercised its right of protest, and had officially expressed its satisfaction with the further action of the General Synod and its willingness to co-operate with it. Its provision made in 1853 had therefore been satisfied. It had been a protest against a faction within the General Synod, not against the official action of the General Synod. In 1864 that faction had gained a victory and had suffered a defeat. Its victory had been the admission of the Franckean Synod, its defeat the change of the Constitution of the General Synod. But a second victory had been the election of the officers of the General Synod. It was this second victory, and not the first, which became the occasion of the separation in 1866. On the confessional side, the radicals had not been able to introduce any change into the General Synod's Constitution: the confessional party carried such change into the Constitution.

They had also, especially in the two years falling between the two critical meetings of the General Synod in 1864 and 1866 taken other steps beyond anything which the radical party had been able to undertake. They had opened a theological seminary and established a Church paper. If the radicals had gone beyond the position of the General Synod on the one side, so had the confessional party gone beyond the General Synod's position on the other side. The large portion of the General Synod belonged to neither extreme, but held a conservative General Synod position, believing the official position of the General Synod sufficient and satisfactory.

There were a number of reasons why this large neutral party should favor the men of the radical party, rather than the men of the confessional party, although they might disapprove of their extreme positions. The radical party had grown up within the General Synod: the men belonging to it were old and well-known men of the General Synod. The men of the confessional

party were with few exceptions younger men and had but recently come back into the General Synod.

It may be possible to find an analogy to the status of affairs in the General Synod of those days, in the present General Synod. As the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY shows from time to time, there is a younger element composed of men, who have been reading modern theology and have been influenced by it. They ask for a more liberal interpretation of the attitude of the Church on a number of questions. They regard some positions of the older theology as scientifically untenable. They intend no hostility to the General Synod, but ask the right to grow within the General Synod. If these young men should control a Synod, and demand recognition for their advanced positions they too might find the organization of a new body inevitable.

In 1864 there were still two growing tendencies within the General Synod. One was under the influence of American conditions, the other under the influence of European confessionalism. The one was a natural growth within the American Lutheran Church, the other was grafted upon it from the outside, although in part it grew up within it. The real strength of the confessional party however lay in the prestige given their position by the strongly confessional German and Scandinavian Synods which were foreign in origin and constituency. These German and Scandinavian Synods owed their confessionalism to the crisis of 1817, the formation of the Prussian Union. The General Synod knew of no such crisis, and could regard the confessionalism derived from Germany as a foreign interest, just as the modern American Church regards the influence of German theology as a dangerous importation.

A third tendency within the General Synod was that which led to the return of the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1853, in spite of the resolution adopted in 1823, that the Synod would not send delegates to the General Synod "until at some future time the congregations themselves recognize that they have misapprehended our purpose and urge the reconsideration of the matter." This tendency was one of unification. The Lutheran Church in America should be one. And the elements not belonging to the General Synod were exactly those Synods of foreign origin which were thoroughly confessional. The only hope of uniting the Lutheran Church in America lay in an effort

to bring the General Synod to a more confessional position. Thus the confessional party within the General Synod not only stood for a confessional position, but also for the union of all the synods with the General Synod. One fact was overlooked, however: in order to bring all synods into the General Synod the historic continuity of the General Synod was to be strained to the uttermost. The natural historic development was to be forced out of its natural channels. And against this forcing the natural conservatism of the General Synod protested, just as the natural conservatism of our men in the Church today protests against the slightest manifestation of European influence, let us say along the lines of the higher criticism.

The confessional element within the General Synod thus stood for the two tendencies, a return to the full acceptance of the Confessions of the Lutheran Church, and the union of the Lutheran Church into one general body. And the separation came at the very moment when the advance in the confessional position of the General Synod might have made it possible to look forward to a more hopeful future in the question of union among the synods. Indeed the Pennsylvania Ministerium commended the action of the General Synod in 1864 as tending to "promote the cause of unity and the purity of our beloved Zion." In 1848 Dr. C. P. Krauth, Jr., had written: "We must allow some variation in our American Church. I ask no more than that the basis of the General Synod shall be faithfully adhered to." (Letter to B. M. Schmucker, Spaeth, *Life of Krauth*, I, 188). In 1851 he wrote to Rev. J. A. Seiss, who was then "almost ripe for re-organization," "As regards re-organization, I do not think matters are ripe for any decided move. Truth is winning its way silently in our Church. Let us hold it together tightly, that we may carry it as one body into the camp of truth." (Ibid. 193). True, in 1852 he wrote: "If Dr. Kurtz's positions about the General Synod are true, its destiny is told. It can never become a General Synod." (Ibid. 196). In 1858 in an excellent editorial in the *Evangelical Review*, giving a survey of the American Lutheran Church, Dr. C. P. Krauth, Sr., wrote, out of his wide knowledge and with his clear judgment: "The basis of the General Synod on which two-thirds of the Lutheran Church in the United States are united, may be regarded as alone adapted to hold together the elements, somewhat discordant, of our Lu-

theran Zion. This abandoned, division will ensue, one will be separated into many, and our record will be, not one out of many, but many out of one. \* \* \* For ourselves, we say, that if any in the General Synod cannot sanction the principles there developed [in the Charleston Discourse, published in the Evangelical Review, Vol. II, p. 1.], if their Symbolism be so intense that they cannot tolerate those who differ from them, they can go to Buffalo, to Iowa, to Columbus. It is what we would do ourselves, under similar circumstances—no disrespect is meant. On the other hand, if there are others whose antipathies to the symbols is so great, that they cannot endure those who venerate and *ex animo* subscribe them, they should look for some more congenial home. For if, on the one hand, the symbolist is unwarranted in disputing the Lutheranism of him who does not receive every jot and tittle, but who has met the requisition of the General Synod's basis, so on the other, the latter has no right to dispute the claims of the former to the fullest recognition as a Lutheran. Any attempt to disfranchise either one or the other, and particularly when it assumes the form of legislation, is revolutionary, and ought to be hissed from the stage. \* \* \* \* Fidelity to the principles of the General Synod is the only guarantee of a peaceful and prosperous church." (Ev. Rev. July, 1858 x:11-15). If we contrast with these words those of Dr. Mann written in 1877, at the close of ten years of the General Council, we may appreciate their sound wisdom: "Nothing but conflicts between feelings and theological reasoning! Being rooted and grown on the symbols of the sixteenth century, the Lutheran Church cannot do justice to the pressure of the nineteenth. Torn away from those ancient, manly and solemn testimonies, she is a historical lie, and the contemptible shuttle-cock of the fluctuating opinions of the day. There is no real satisfaction in either direction. And yet, in truth, there is no time less fitted to formulate symbols than ours. I do not feel comfortable in this whole affair." (Letter to Dr. Schaff, quoted in Spaeth, *Memorial*, p. 46). When we remember that of those extreme symbolist synods referred to by Dr. Krauth, Sr., not one has been in permanent connection with the General Council, we may admit that his vision was clear even in his prophecy. We can only regret that his more brilliant son should have been the one more than any other responsible for the step against which



his father had argued. The hope which animated Dr. Krauth, Jr., of being able to unite the Lutheran Church in America, was never realized. Almost all of the constituent synods of the General Council at present either had formerly belonged to the General Synod, or have been more recently organized. The General Synod has gradually grown toward a more confessional position, without the help of the confessional element which left it, and in spite of the fact that they left it. The General Council has been more isolated from American influences, has grown more artificially, and is less open to modifications such as come naturally with time, than the General Synod was in 1866 or is now. It overleaped the period from Muhlenberg to Krauth in America, from the middle of the nineteenth to the seventeenth century in Germany, and found a fixed position which was called the Lutheran position. It lost the historical sense, and has never regained it.

The men who organized the General Council were very human, just as were the men who formulated the Confessions of the sixteenth century. They were subject to the same historical limitations as other men, as e. g., Benjamin Kurtz and Dr. S. S. Schmucker. The star of Dr. Schmucker and of Dr. Kurtz was declining, the star of Dr. Krauth, Jr., was growing in influence as well as in brilliance within the General Synod in 1866. A little more patience would have seen the passing years do their work. The separation was not due to an over-ruling providence, nor to an arbitrary fate, but to the men who separated at the moment when all the indications pointed to a growth which would eliminate some and bring the rest closer together.

The most regrettable feature of it all is that now there have been formed two traditions within the Lutheran Church of America. The General Council tradition claims for it responsibility and credit for all the good that has grown in the General Synod. It has its position fixed and unalterable, and cannot make any concession. The General Synod has grown, but has not yet reached in full the position of the General Council, and is not willing to yield its historic growth. In the meantime, the General Council has in so far influenced the development of the General Synod, as to remove it from the vital influence of the present to a large extent. The problem of the General Synod has been more or less to restore a fellowship with the General

Council, on the well-understood basis of no concessions by the General Council. It has had so much less freedom to accommodate itself to the needs of the times. To use Dr. Mann's words, "the Lutheran Church cannot do justice to the pressure of the nineteenth century" because the General Council has sided with the foreign synods of the West in binding it to the symbols of the sixteenth century, without acknowledging the limitations of those symbols which grow out of their historical origin and purpose. What Dr. Mann recognized as a dilemma is in truth a problem, which the Lutheran Church in America has shirked, largely because the men of a confessional tendency in the General Synod in 1866 shirked the work of following up their advantage within the General Synod, and preferred to give it all up because they could not have all they asked.

*South Bethlehem, Pa.*

## ARTICLE V.

### THE FUNCTION OF THE MINISTER IN DIVINE WORSHIP.

BY REV. HARRY D. NEWCOMER.

St. James gives a very definite statement as to the genesis of all that man has that is needful and good, holy and beautiful, for time and eternity, when he says, "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

St. James with the rest of the sacred writers, tells us that we are indebted to the grace of God for all material and spiritual blessings. History and experience teach us that God does not directly and immediately minister unto us his bounties, but they come to us indirectly through means and instruments.

The vitalizing energy which comes to us through the prepared meal might, if in the judgment and wisdom of God it seemed good, be transmitted directly to our bodies without means of bread, but such is not God's ordained method of caring for and feeding our bodies.

Doubtless if God saw fit, he could very easily and readily, immediately and directly, bring to our souls the higher blessings we enjoy in the Bread of life; and yet in the wisdom and judgment of God it seemed best to connect our spiritual blessings with the means of grace—the Word and the Sacraments.

But the means of grace are useless without the intervention of a human agent. For the administration of these means of grace, whereby God's blessings are communicated to his people He has called a ministry.

God's Word is always efficacious and powerful, sharper than any two-edged sword, whether quietly meditated upon, or read; yet its solemn and authoritative use is associated with public worship, and the proper administration of the blessed Word, and the conducting of divine worship demands the service of a ministry.

In extreme necessity and under special conditions Baptism

may be administered by lay-members, but ordinarily, and when at all possible, it should be administered by an ordained ministry, and the Lord's Supper always demands the presence of the ministry. The means of Grace properly understood and rightly used, demand a recognition of the necessity of public worship and of a ministry.

A proper analysis of Divine Worship reveals the fact that there are three elements or factors in it: God's people, who are to be fed with the sincere milk of God's Word, and to whom heavenly blessings are to be administered; the minister, who is to distribute and administer these blessings; and the Means of Grace—the Word and the Sacraments—by and through which these blessings are brought near to the people and appropriated by them through faith in Christ Jesus. We can at once see how the place of the minister in Divine Worship becomes a very important one, as well as essential, since he is to lead and feed the people spiritually, and has to deal with sacred and divine things.

The calling and ordination of a Divine Ministry is clearly taught and authorized by Christ Himself. He called disciples and apostles, and sent them out with a specific command to administer heavenly blessings to a sinful world. "And when He had called unto Him twelve disciples, He gave them power over unclean spirits, to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease."

The Master's charge to Peter, at the miraculous draught of fishes, where Jesus in a conversation made Peter confess his love for him was, "Feed my lambs," and twice, "feed my sheep;" and the feeding Peter was to do was not physical, but spiritual.

The work of feeding the lambs and the sheep is not limited to any particular class or sect, but is to comprise the whole of humanity; and for this special work of feeding the sheep there is necessary a human agency.

Christ said, "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you," and this message was given to His disciples on the evening of His resurrection to outline anew their work at a time when their hearts were filled with fear and evil forebodings about their own future, and that of the Church. The more important the work, of whatever sort it may be, the greater the responsibility and need of special fitness. In the administration of heavenly blessings, and the breaking of the Bread of Life, committed unto a

human agency, there comes a grave responsibility and solemn obligation.

While it is true that the efficacy of Baptism and the Lord's Supper does not depend, absolutely, on the piety, spirituality or fitness of the ministrant, yet the piety, spiritual life and fitness of the ministrant play a very important part in the administering of the Sacraments. The purer the vessel through whom the Means of Grace are conveyed, the better the effect and the greater the helpfulness to the one who receives them.

Christ said, "No man can come unto me, except the Father Who hath sent me draw him;" therefore the Church is born by the Word and the Sacraments, for these are the only means of Grace to renew and regenerate the sinful heart. By the administration of the sacrament of Baptism, and the preaching of the Word, by the ordained minister, the congregation has been brought into being, and the worshipping congregation thus founded, hath been quickened, strengthened and kept spiritually alive by the power of the Holy Spirit manifested through the faithful administration of the Means of Grace.

The minister's place in Divine Worship is therefore more than ordinary, and deserves, as well as demands, more than a mere passing consideration. When a man feels himself called to God's holy ministry, it becomes him to look especially into his fitness to deal with sacred and divine things, and nothing commonplace be allowed to exist in his life, or in divine worship. To stand before the people as God's mouthpiece, in the preaching of the Word, at the administering of Holy Baptism and the Sacrament of the Altar, is by no means a small thing, and demands deep piety, thorough consecration and the highest possible fitness on the part of the ministrant.

In the Sacrament of the Altar, Christ, through the agency of the minister, comes to every communicant, and imparts to him His Body and Blood—a savor of life unto life to them that believe, and a savor of death unto death to the unbelieving and impenitent. Through the word of the minister, which is God's Word, absolution follows a confession of sin, as surely as if God Himself spake it from Heaven. In the reading of the Word, God's will and grace are authoritatively declared by the minister, and in the sermon the gospel is applied to the present needs and wants of God's people.

The minister in attending to his specific functions in the divine worship of the Church stands in a representative capacity;—he is either the representative of God, speaking to His people, or the representative of the people speaking for them and in their name to God. In the singing of the hymns he properly joins the congregation in their worship as a member of the congregation. In the public prayer the minister becomes the representative of the people, speaking to God for them, bearing their petitions and prayers before the throne of Grace, invoking God's blessings, and the guidance of the Spirit in divine worship. In this part of divine worship it would be entirely fitting and proper for the minister to face, with the people, the altar, for as a member of the congregation he prays for himself and the people, representing the whole congregation before God. But this is not generally done in our Lutheran churches, even where the altar is found, because custom and usage among our people generally is for the minister to face the people in all parts of the service. The writer of this paper, in whose church an altar is found, himself is following custom and usage rather than the strictly liturgical fitness of prayer. This breach of order may possibly be classed as "Adiaphoristic," but I believe that the minister's facing the altar with the congregation would, if generally practiced, add to the solemnity and dignity of public worship.

In the preaching of the Word the minister is the representative of God, and is to bring God's message to His people and should do it in an orderly manner. Paul in speaking to the early Christians said, "Let all things be done in decency and in order."

The early Church has supplied us with an illustration of order and natural progression in public worship, going naturally and easily from one part of the service to the other. The minister, who is the leader of public worship, should give the several parts of the service their proper place and use, so that there be no break or disconnecting link in the service or worship of the Most High; but rather an agreeable and natural progression from the beginning of the Divine Service to the end.

In the consideration of the minister's place in divine worship, his personal bearing and deportment must be taken into consideration. Dr. Krauss says, "We are not held by any Donatistic views of the ministry, and we have learned long ago that God's

Means of Grace are always efficacious. Water is water, and refreshes whether it comes through a pipe of lead or of gold. God's Word, even if preached without any accompaniment of rhetorical grace, or without any pleasing style or diction, is efficacious and powerful; yet who would not prefer to have the grace of the Gospel come to him with the embellishments of the graces of polite speech?

"The Sacrament of the Altar rightly administered is valid and efficacious, even if the nails of the ministrant are in mourning, and his hands presenting the sacred wafer, bring unmistakable suggestions of the reeking atmosphere of the livery-stable, as has been the case with many. But who would not much rather have the Means of Grace administered to him by one who does not shock refined sensibilities and who does not accompany the presentation of the pure Word of God with the exhibition of an utter lack of good taste? The minister's bearing and deportment, his "personal equation" if you please, in every part of the service may be so offensive as to detract from his usefulness as a leader in Divine Worship."

To the person who does not possess a liturgical spirit, and whose taste for things orderly is not properly cultivated, some of the things that must be said about the minister in Divine Worship may seem trifling and perhaps ridiculous. It would be foolish to discuss colors with one born blind, or to try to impress upon the deaf the merits of the musical works of the masters; but to the person who appreciates order, exactness and a liturgical usage, things that with some are called commonplace, are of great importance. A minister can not lay too much stress on the performance or doing of what some would call the little things.

The minister who is desirous to make the highest possible use of the services of the Church for his people, must see to it that all things are properly arranged and attended to before he enters the chancel to begin the sacred offices. The lessons for the day should be found and clearly marked in the Bible on the Lectern, so that there be no awkward pausing during the services while the pastor is searching for the lessons. The pulpit Bible should be open at the proper place, and all manuscripts and notes, if any, conveniently arranged. The service-book, and everything else needed, should be so placed as to be at hand when required.

If this work is deferred until after the minister comes before



his people to begin the services, it leaves the impression that he does not have a proper sense of the importance of the service he is about to perform, as a representative of God and His people. To see a minister rush into the chancel, and go from side to side to arrange things that should have been put in order before the services, and to nervously handle the pages of the sacred Scriptures in hunting the lessons, is neither edifying nor worshipful, and yet this is often done by ministers. The minister should be in a worshipful mood from the beginning to the end of the services, and anything done by him which is not adding to the value and efficiency of the worship, is neither dignified nor becoming the holy office which he fills as God's representative in divine worship.

A minister should always pay due attention to his personal appearance in the pulpit. Anything striking or flashy in the dress of the minister should be carefully avoided. There surely is not much dignity or fitness (shall we say reverence?) in a minister coming into the pulpit with a black or blue coat, a flashy silk vest, a loud striped pair of trousers and a bright necktie. All this gives the minister more the appearance of an Atlantic City Board-walk sport than of a minister of the Gospel—The Ambassador of Christ. The matter of pulpit dress may seem to some to be a small consideration, but it is of greater importance than many ministers seem to be willing to give it. We admit that the distinctive dress or robe for the minister is "adiaphoristic" yet we insist that a chaste and refined taste demands a modest, quiet, dignified dress for the pulpit.

We believe the gown is the most appropriate and best suited dress for the minister in the pulpit. We would not be understood as contending that the pulpit gown is absolutely essential to true worship, but we do believe that it adds reverence to the worship and sets apart the minister for his holy office and as the real leader in the service. If the gown is not worn, let the minister come into the pulpit with a full black suit. Some people may be over censorious about the personal appearance of their pastor, and yet they have a right to expect him to be neat and clean, dignified and self-respecting, as their leader in divine worship.

Let us suppose, then, that all necessary arrangements have been made, and that the minister is ready to begin the service.

Precisely at the time appointed let him enter the chancel. His coming into the chancel, his entering into the presence of the congregation and the manner in which he moves from place to place in the chancel, are not without their effect upon the service and demand careful thought and prayer. Dr. Krauss says, "The minister must not enter the chancel with swinging arms and in a rapid stride, nor must he make a cross cut, and approach the altar from the side. On the other hand he must not by the painful slowness of his movements and his precise posturing give the suggestion of an automaton. Good taste demands a devout and reverent bearing in keeping with the character of the place. Any suggestion of affectation on the one hand or of levity on the other is detrimental."

A minister should be self-composed, have self-control, and as far as possible not show any signs of nervousness, for these things detract from the worship, and leave an unfavorable impression. He who cannot control himself will not be able to hold and influence a congregation in public discourse. There are those who are playing with the handkerchief, with a watch charm or walking up and down the pulpit platform during the sermon, with their hands in their pockets, to the disgust of the more refined and less sensational. We read the praises of peripatetic philosophers, but we find nothing to command or warrant the actions of a peripatetic minister.

A minister must not be walking about the chancel during the singing of the hymns, or after the collects, or Amens, for he is in this part of the service to worship with the congregation of which he is a part. The minister should retain his seat to the end of the singing of the hymn and then deliberately proceed to the pulpit. If he needs private prayer before the sermon, let him teach his people that they need prayer as well to receive it properly.

Dr. Krauss says, "One of the most common faults of the minister in performing his functions in the chancel is the injection of the dramatic element, and the bringing into the pulpit the thread-bare devices of the cheap teacher of dramatic and elocutionary reading. Scripture is to be read intelligently and with proper decorum and reverence. The fact must always be kept in mind that it is God's Word, and that the officiating minister is simply the agent through whom this Word is mediated to the

people. He is not to read it so as to show off elocutionary skill. The highest art is to conceal art. It is not considered good liturgical taste to look up from the page in reading the Scripture." The habit which many ministers have of frequent ejaculations and interpretation of the Scriptures, during the reading of the lessons, is in bad liturgical taste and should be avoided.

All our ministers should be fully acquainted with the practical parts of Liturgies. Whatever their own feeling and conviction may be on the "Common Service" they should by all means learn to understand it thoroughly and be able to use it freely and worshipfully for they will get into pulpits where they will be compelled to use it, and they will be greatly embarrassed if they must stumble through it. It is the service of the Church. A large majority of our congregations already use it, and the time is coming when all the congregations will want it. No one can afford to be ignorant of the use of this beautiful Service.

Again I believe a minister may sin tremendously against good liturgical taste and feeling in conducting the prayers of the congregation. With many persons the impression prevails that the public prayers of the congregation are the minister's prayers. The minister is not praying for himself, but leading the congregation in prayer. Some extremely pious souls are deadly opposed to the minister reading a prayer, and demand that he "make his own prayers." In many cases they are his own prayers indeed—his very, very own—considered in the light of the grammar, diction and arrangement. Some of the "free" or extempore prayers are not very edifying or worshipful to one who has a taste for good Liturgies or for dignified worship.

Some preachers pray at their people rather than with them, trying to preach to them under the pretense of prayer; this seems irreverent, undignified and unworshipful. Congregational prayer means the pastor and people together calling upon God in praise and thanksgiving. We must distinguish between private prayer and public congregational prayer. The minister is not to make the private prayer for his people, but a public congregational prayer, in which there should be common supplications, prayers, intercessions and thanksgiving. The minister should be fully acquainted with the chaste and scriptural forms of public prayer which have come down to us, hallowed and fragrant with the worship of the saints of all ages. If one is fa-

miliar with the prayers of the Church for the different seasons and festivals of the year, he will not be so likely to fall into the individualism and gush that characterize so much of what is called public prayer.

There is no objection to extempore prayer when the prayer is thought out and made to conform to the theme and subject of the sermon, which should be in harmony with the Season, or Festival, of the "Church Year." It would be far better for many ministers if they read their prayers instead of giving their own prayers filled with "Oh's," "Ah's" and "would that's," and other meaningless phrases. Intelligent prayer demands that we be informed beforehand what is to be prayed for. It is not fair to call on any one to pray without notifying him in advance, except perhaps in a general devotional service.

Just a word about changing the hallowed responses and formularies which have come down to us with many precious associations. I believe the service is spoiled and robbed of its beauty by changing any of the responses. For instance, as an illustration, what right has any minister to change the form of the Apostolic or Aaronic benediction? I have heard all manner of "benedictions" that have no scriptural authority. The following is a form of benediction often used, "The grace of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ, the infinite love of God, our Heavenly Father, and the communion and fellowship of the Holy Ghost be with you all now and forevermore." When we quote Scripture we should quote it correctly.

Any arbitrary changing of the service is a misdemeanor and not permissible by good liturgical order. In using the Scriptural sentences provided for the administration of the elements and the dismissal of the communicants at the Lord's Supper we should quote them correctly, and yet many ministers so change and distort the Word that you can hardly recognize it. A man is not compelled to use all of the Service, nor indeed any part of it. But whatever part is used, should be used as given in our formularies. Otherwise, it would be better not to use it at all.

I do not set myself up as a capable critic of the minister's place and personal bearing in Divine Worship, but have simply given a few suggestions on matters which to me seem important. I have called attention to what in my humble judgment, seems to be bad taste and a misdemeanor in Divine Worship. "With

charity to all, and malice towards none," I do not wish to be considered personal in anything that I have said, for I have spoken in a general sense.

Let me close my paper by saying, "We cannot exalt the office of the ministry too highly, we cannot pay too much attention to ourselves and the things we are dealing with in Divine Worship, nor can we, as ministers, make our services too impressive. We represent God before the people, and as such, we need to be careful in all that we do and say in Divine Worship, as also in our daily walk and life."

*Baltimore, Md.*

## ARTICLE VI.

SOCIALISM—A MENACE TO THE HOME, CHURCH  
AND STATE.

BY REV. RALPH H. BERGSTRESSER.

Socialism is a philosophy of life founded on the Marxian program. It attempts a universal explanation of life, its conditions and relations, on an economic basis. Morris Hillquit, an eminent American authority on Socialism, says "Altogether it is high time for the American public to abandon the myth of the 'diverse meanings of Socialism' and the 'diverse kinds of Socialism.' The International Socialistic movement with its thirty million adherents, at a conservative estimate, and its organized parties in about twenty-five civilized countries in both hemispheres, is all based on the same Marxian program." It is interesting to note that the Marxian program denies the existence of God, the freedom of the human will, the immortality of the soul. It attempts to explain life and history on the theory of economic determinism, which means that the bread and butter question is the most important question in life, that the world's sentiments and religions, its art and literature are all rooted in the struggle for control of the food supply. Economic determinism teaches that everything is based upon economic conditions, that even the home, Church and State are not of divine origin, but founded upon the markets. As soon as this economic struggle ceases through the establishment of a co-operative commonwealth, these three institutions will perish.

## (1). The Attitude of Socialism towards the home.

Engels says, "Three great obstacles block the way of social reform; private property, religion, and the present form of marriage." LaMonte, "As fast as they become class conscious, they will recognize and praise as moral all conduct that tends to hasten the social revolution, and they will condemn as unhesitatingly immoral all conduct that tends to prolong the dominance of the capitalistic class."

The marriage contract is upheld by the Socialists as only temporary. Jean Jaures says, "When the Socialist party is in

power it will not be guilty of rendering marriage a restraining contract of any kind. Each one of the contracting parties will be free to continue to lead the joint life or to break a bond which may have been galling. Socialist society will hold that it would be hypocrisy or hardness of heart to show any signs of reproval if two such beings sought happiness in another union."

LaMonte, "From the Socialistic viewpoint the monogamous family ceases to be a divine institution and becomes the historical product of certain definite economic conditions. Free love is the only kind of love that has ever existed; compulsory or bound love is a contradiction of terms. Socialists advocate a higher form of marriage in which love will be the only tie and love the only sanction."

That choice classic of Socialist literature, Engels' "Origin of the Family", which the *New York Call*, a Socialist paper published in New York City, recommended as necessary for a full understanding of Socialism, and further stated that every Socialist woman should become a book agent to sell this book has the following to say on marriage: "If marriage founded on love is moral, then it follows that marriage is moral only as long as love lasts. The duration of an attack of individual self love varies considerably, according to individual disposition, especially in men. A positive cessation of fondness or its replacement by a new passionate love makes a separation a blessing for both parties concerned."

August Bebel, who wrote "Woman and Socialism," recommended as a text book on the woman question by the Socialist party, has been hailed as the emancipator of woman. What does Bebel say? "Prostitution is to-day a necessary social institution, just as the police, standing armies, the Church, etc. Man-kind will have to return to nature, and to the natural condition existing in nature. It must cast off the now ruling and unhealthy spiritual notions concerning marriage."

The Communist Manifesto, the magna charta of Socialism, says, "The family will vanish as a matter of course with the vanishing of capital."

These pestiferous notions concerning the institution of the family continue to be widely diffused through Socialistic works, Socialist publishing houses, and Socialist authorities of every



description, nor have they ever been repudiated by any significant number of prominent Socialists.

(2). Socialism is likewise a bitter and avowed enemy of the Church. As in the above discussion of the home I shall only quote from recognized Socialistic writers whose books are recommended by the Socialist party as containing the teachings of Socialism.

Marx says, "We do well if we stir hatred and contempt against all prevailing ideas of religion, of the State, of country, of patriotism. The idea of God is the keystone of perverted Christianity. The true root of civilization, the true root of liberty, of equality, of culture, is atheism." Liebknecht states, "It is our duty as Socialists to cast out the faith in God with all our zeal, nor is any one worthy of the name who does not consecrate himself to the spread of atheism."

These men are recognized leaders of the Socialist party. E. B. Aveling, who it is reported had a wife and family in London, but formed a love union with Eleanor, the younger daughter of Marx, and who lived together as man and wife, both later committing suicide as did the sister of Eleanor, said "Marx was an avowed atheist, and those who desire to know the scientific reasons for the materialism of Marx, Engels, Bebel, Liebknecht, La Fargue and Adler, in a word, of all the founders and teachers of scientific socialism, should read the whole of the introduction written by Frederick Engels, in 1892, to my translation of 'Socialism, Scientific and Utopian.'"

George D. Herron, deposed Congregationalist preacher, who deserted his wife and children, and was united in a love marriage with Carrie Rand a prominent Socialist, by simply declaring their love for each other in the presence of a few friends, and who was received at once with open arms by the Socialist party as one of their trusted leaders, says, "Every appeal to men to become Socialists in the name of Christianity must result in the corruption and betrayal of Socialism in the end. Christianity stands for what is lowest and basest in life. The Church sounds the lowest note in human life. It is the most degrading of all our institutions and the most brutalizing in its effects on common life."

Now I wish to show you the hypocrisy of the Socialist party. The platform of the party adopted at Chicago, May 1908, had in

it a plank stating that the Socialist party is not concerned with matters of religious belief. When the subject of religion came up, many expressed regret that it was mentioned, inasmuch as it would not make good campaign material. The following quotations are taken from the Official Proceedings of that convention and can be found on pages 191 et seq.

Mr. Strickland said, "If economic determinism be true and if the moral and ethical principles of society be based ultimately upon the manner of economic production, how dare we say then that we have nothing to do with religion." Mr. Lewis, another delegate, said, "I am among those who sincerely hoped that the question of religion would not be raised at this convention. I am willing to concede that we should let sleeping dogs lie. I know that the Socialist position on the question of religion does not make a good campaign subject. If we must speak I propose that we shall go before this country with the truth and not with a lie." Mr. Hillquit then said, "We should not go out in our propaganda among the people who are still groping in obscurity and tell them that they must first become materialists before they become members of the Socialist party. After we have disposed of the things which touch their material welfare it will be time to approach them with the consequences of the Socialist philosophy."

The plank carried by a majority of one, and there was given out to the world the statement that the Socialist party was not concerned in matters of religious belief, which some of their own leaders declared was a lie.

My attention was first drawn to Socialism when I noticed that as soon as men become real Socialists they dropped out of the Church; and later when I saw the statement of Hillquit that 99 per cent. of the Socialist party were agnostics, (see Off. Pro. p. 193), I began to study Socialism. The more I studied it the more I saw it was wholly destructive of Christianity. Bebel summed up the question when he said, "Christianity and Socialism stand towards each other as fire and water."

(3). In conclusion let us see what Socialism teaches concerning the State.

Socialism entirely ignores the State in the spirit, content, sweep and purpose of its existence. It is un-American in character; unpatriotic in its teachings; it is international in its mis-

sion and appeal. If, under the Socialistic regime religion is to die out, and the monogamic family is to be destroyed, then from the very nature of things the State will perish.

Socialism seeks not reform, but revolution. The leaders of the movement have not left us in the dark about how the revolution shall take place when it comes; they have opened their minds with amazing frankness. The Socialist members of the German Reichstag actually voted against measures intended to improve the condition of the workingmen on the principle that the sooner conditions became unbearable, the sooner the revolution would take place. Socialists say there are two kinds of revolution, peaceful and violent. I do not accuse the Socialists of planning deep conspiracies, of laying mines or throwing bombs, because many of the rank and file of the party would be opposed to such a course, and the leaders realize that such actions would pull down upon their heads the very structure they are seeking to erect. But the leaders of the movement have not shown any hesitancy in revealing how the revolution shall take place when the time is ripe.

Marx and Engels are open in their advocacy of violence. Marx says: "In most countries of Europe violence must be the lever of our Social reform. We must finally have recourse to violence in order to establish the rule of labor. Let the ruling classes tremble at the communist revolution! When our turn comes, revolutionary terrorism will not be sugarcoated. There is but one way of simplifying, shortening, concentrating the death agony of the old society, as well as the bloody labor of the new world's birth—revolutionary terror."

Jack London says in the *International Soc. Review*, (Aug. 1909), "In the United States there are 400,000 men who begin their letters, 'Dear Comrade,' and ended them, 'Yours for revolution.' In Germany there are 3,000,000 men who begin their letters, 'Dear Comrade,' and sign them, 'Yours for the revolution.' In France, 1,000,000 men, in Austria 800,000, in Belgium 300,000, etc., comrades all, and revolutionists. These are numbers that dwarf the grand armies of Napoleon and Xerxes, but they are numbers not of maintenance of the established order, but of conquest and revolution."

Permit me to quote from a few other American authorities on

Socialism,—Morris Hillquit, Victor Berger, Eugene Debs, and John Spargo.

Hillquit, in his "Socialism in Theory and Practice," says, "The Socialist program is silent on the question whether the gradual expropriation of the possessing class will be accomplished by a process of confiscation or by the method of compensation. The Socialists are not much concerned about this issue."

The other American authors are more definite in their statements. Victor Berger, the first and only Socialist to occupy a seat in Congress, a Socialist of international reputation, said at the Chicago Convention of the Socialist party, in 1908, as published in the *Off. Pro.*, page 242, "I have heard it pleaded many a time right here in our own meetings by speakers in attendance that the only salvation for the proletariat of America is direct action; that the ballot box is simply a humbug. Now I don't know how this question is going to be solved. I have no doubt that in the last analysis we must shoot; and when it comes to shooting, Wisconsin will be there. We always make good." Again, "We want to keep out of the party everybody who is not in harmony with our main principles, and who are opposed to the fundamental idea of the party, which means the ballot box. In order to be able to shoot, even, some day, we must have the power of the political government in our own hands, at least to a great extent."

Eugene Debs said at St. Louis in 1897, "The time will come to incite the populace. In the very near future there will be an uprising of the people. Congress will be dispersed and the Supreme Court abolished. When that time comes you can count on me. I will be ready to shed the last drop of my blood."

Spargo, one of the most prolific writers in America on Socialism, says (page 172, "Syndicalism"), "If the class to which I belong could be set free from exploitation by the violation of the laws made by the master class, by open rebellion, by seizing the property of the rich, by setting the torch to a few buildings, or by the summary execution of a few members of the possessing class, I hope that the courage to share the work would be mine."

This in brief is the logical conclusion of Socialism. The home, Church and State are considered as the offshoots of capitalism, and when capitalism is destroyed these three institutions will cease. The future co-operative commonwealth is pictured

as one containing for man the utmost freedom, the government being concerned only with the administration of things. Environments will be perfect and therefore no sin in the heart of man.

Bebel, "Woman and Socialism," even goes so far as to say, "Neither political nor common crimes will be known in the future. Thieves will have disappeared. Neither tramps nor vagabonds. Murder? Why? No one can enrich himself at the expense of others, and even the murder for hatred and revenge is directly or indirectly connected with the social system. Blasphemy? Nonsense! It will be left to good and Almighty God himself to punish whoever has offended him, provided that the existence of God is still a matter of controversy. Together with abolition of the State will vanish its representatives: ministers, parliaments, standing armies, police courts, lawyers, district attorneys, prison officials, collectors of taxes and duties, etc."

There are many evils to-day in our social life that require correction. But there is a vast difference between knowing that conditions are wrong and having an adequate remedy. But after all is said about the terrible economic conditions that prevail, the deeper, the more important, the vital question, is what shall be done to soften the human heart, to elevate the human mind, and to discipline the human will? The answer to this question is to be found only in the teachings of Christ, and that will be the solution of the economic question.

*Aliotoona, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VII.

## CHRISTIANITY AND THE MODERN MIND.

BY REV. B. LEDERER.

In October, 1912, there appeared in the LUTHERAN QUARTERLY an article entitled "The Minister and Modern Thought," a subject of paramount importance, in which every Lutheran minister should be intensely interested. He must be acquainted with the problems that confront the world to-day, understand the thought of our age and know whether the gospel which we preach is adapted to modern conditions. By all means let Lutheran ministers keep in touch with their age, be thoroughly educated, modern men of modern times, and ready to have an answer to every question which the generation of to-day may ask of the Church.

There are a great many people to-day who believe that the minister who sincerely accepts as his own confession of faith all the doctrinal statements in the confessions of the Lutheran Church must for this reason be sadly out of touch with the age in which he is living. On the day after the General Synod at Richmond, Ind., had adopted as its confession of faith the statement that the Bible is the Word of God, there appeared an editorial in a local paper declaring that the Lutheran preachers apparently paid not the least attention to the assured results of modern scientific investigations, but preferred to adhere to the traditional views of medieval times. The writer of the present article has in the course of his ministry met a great number of ministers connected with all branches of the Protestant Church, who believed that in order to be abreast with the thought of their age they had to reject a great deal of what we call the orthodox, evangelical faith, and who were especially eager to defend the theory of evolution. He never gained the impression that these men were possessed of extraordinary intellectual ability or distinguished themselves by particularly clear and logical thinking. Last year we received a copy of *Das Monistische Jahrhundert*, the official organ of the German Monistic Association, whose honorary president was the well

known evolutionist and leader of "modern thought," Professor Dr. Haeckel of Jena. There was an article in this paper by an American Lutheran minister (not of the General Synod). This gentleman reported with great glee to the evolutionists in Germany that their ideas are spreading in the Protestant churches of America and that the example of Prof. Dr. Shailer Mathews, of the University of Chicago, in professing adherence to the theory of evolution, the dominant idea of modern thought, was being followed generally by Protestant ministers in this country. The gentleman gave his name as Professor Dr. . . . . ., Buffalo, N. Y. Now as a matter of fact this brother is no doctor, neither is he a professor in Buffalo, N. Y., but when his article was published he was pastor of a very small congregation in Indiana. Here we have an instance of the intellectual sincerity of evolutionistic adherents of "modern thought" in America and Germany. In the summer of 1912 there appeared at the Rock River Bible Conference a brother who delivered a lecture on the kind of pastors needed for students attending state universities. The gentleman, who is no longer a minister in the General Synod, having united with the Presbyterian Church, took the position that only men who accepted the theory of evolution and were, therefore, in touch with the present age, should be commissioned to care for the spiritual needs of university students, for only men of this type could win the confidence of and attract educated people. He said that it does not make much difference whether a minister believes in the virgin birth of Christ or not, and that most ministers shared his opinions, but they did not want to proclaim their views openly for fear of giving offense to many people in their churches.

These critics profess to believe that all who still accept the traditional theology of the Lutheran Church must be either obscurants, who wilfully close their eyes against the light of the latest discoveries of science, or that they must be simply dishonest. They claim that our theology will be wonderfully enriched by these new ideas, but as a matter of fact their new ideas are not new at all, and our traditional theology would not gain anything in strength and power by accepting them. They maintain that their position is based on the assured results of scientific investigation, but a great number of really honest modern scientists reject their conclusions. Notice some of the



assertions they make. Of the theory of evolution Dr. Delk writes as follows: "One great controlling idea it has stimulated in all theological as well as philosophical thinking, i. e., the immanence of God in the whole continuous and endless creative process. It has corrected that conception of God which separates Him from an active entrance into all human nature life." Is this true? Have not all the apostles, the church fathers, the schoolmen, the Reformers and all orthodox theologians profoundly believed in the omnipresence, i. e., immanence of God? It is a pet phrase of the adherents of "modern thought" that the traditional theology of the Church is that of an absentee God, while evolutionists have discovered the great truth of the immanence of God. What dogmatician of the Lutheran Church has ever taught that God is an absentee God? And where do we find in the traditional theology of the Lutheran Church "that conception of God which separates Him from an active entrance into all human nature life?" Evolutionistic modern thought has added no new conception, no new viewpoint to the old gospel, it has not enriched our faith at all. We are told that evolution "has broken down a false dualism—the barrier between the divine and the human." Which false dualism does Dr. Delk mean? Traditional theology accepts that dualism which maintains that God is essentially distinct from the world. Many evolutionists reject this proposition, but we assume that Dr. Delk does not belong to that class of modern thinkers. However, we should like to know a little more about that barrier between the divine and the human, which the old theology left in its place and which had to be taken away by modern thought.

All modern thought opposed to the doctrinal statements of confessional theology is based upon and dominated by the theory of evolution. The so-called new ideas concerning religion, theology, science, social philosophy, Biblical criticism, comparative religion, biology, anthropology and primitive beliefs may all be accounted for by the principles of evolution, which have been applied by the apostles of modern thought to these departments of human knowledge. It is, therefore, necessary that we closely examine the theory of evolution and ask ourselves whether we must accept it in order to keep in touch with our age and be enabled to influence our contemporaries. In order to do this it must be our first business to formulate our ideas

clearly. Clearness always leads the way to truth and whoever seeks truth must first aim at clearness. The statements of the disciples of modern thought are usually vague and hazy.

The word evolution connotes several different ideas which must be sharply distinguished. There has been a process of gradual evolution or development of doctrinal statement in the Christian Church. From the Apostles' Creed to the Augsburg Confession there is a decided change, indicating that the Christian consciousness developed from a childlike faith into more precise dogmatic statements. All Christian truth was already contained in the Apostles' Creed, but in the course of the ages the Christian Church felt it her duty to realize, comprehend, and express more completely the originally simple elements of truth as they are recorded in Scripture. It is to be regretted that not all Lutherans acknowledge the truth of these statements. The Missouri Synod believes that at the time of the Reformation the Church reached the climax of her development, and that we have no higher duty than to appropriate the acquisitions of that period. In the opinion of these Lutherans there has been no further development and growth of Christian knowledge; and their aim is a repristination of conditions at the time of the Reformation, which they consider the golden age of the Church. The result has been in the Missouri Synod a kind of traditionalism, a Romanizing overestimation of the Lutheran Church. Lutheran tradition has been practically put above the Word of God. As a result of such views we would again have conditions in the Lutheran Church as they were before the work of Spener.

We believe that the Holy Spirit, who according to the promise of our Lord was sent to guide the Church into all the truth, has not been inactive since the time of the Reformation. The Church is still developing and has not yet attained "unto a full-grown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." We are pressing on, forgetting the things which are behind and stretching forward to the things which are before. We thank God profoundly for the great things which He did for the Church at the time of the Reformation. We believe that the Church did not then reach her ideal, and that she must hopefully look forward and strive to attain a greater degree of perfection in doctrine and life.

This is the kind of evolution that is taught by such men as Zahn, Seeberg, Gruetzmacher, Hauck and Ihmels. We have, for instance, heard Zahn personally, and know whereof we speak. These men do not belong to the class of Missouri theologians, neither do they professedly or by implication write from an *evolutionary* point of view in the sense of Dr. Delk's article. Will Dr. Delk maintain that Professor Seeberg or Professor Ihmels would write about the fall in this language: "It was rather the emergence of an innocent but ignorant creature into the full light of moral vision and ethical determination?" Dr. Delk's idea of evolution is altogether different from the evolution taught by the men just mentioned. Professor Seeberg writes of evolution as follows: "I indeed accept the idea of evolution, but this evolution is the expression of the divine will, not a *natural* process. The government of God is guiding history in manifold forms. The climax, to which everything is tending, is the divine revelation, through which God comes to man, subjecting him to his gracious government and saving him. Here I stand firm on the foundation of the Biblical gospel... The gospel must remain, but theology must constantly assume new forms, as it has always done in the course of history. The *old water of life* remains, but the shapes and fashions of pumps, pipes and cups are changing." We maintain that this is not the evolutionary theory of Dr. Delk. Our friend seems to be convinced of the same thing, for he states that the Lutheran masters abroad have been overpraised as theologians and thinkers, and that in his humble judgment Seeberg has produced nothing in theology which excels Fairbairn's *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, and his *Philosophy of Religion*. Certainly, for Fairbairn's theory of evolution agrees with that of Dr. Delk; and therefore Fairbairn is probably a greater theologian than Seeberg!

We shall now proceed to examine the theory of evolution which dominates all modern thought opposed to the traditional views of orthodox Christianity and which is held by a number of American, English and German theologians, but not by the great conservative Lutheran writers and scholars, of whom no one can assert that their scholarship is out of date. It is the *theory of descent*, defined by the *New Standard Dictionary* as "the derivation or the doctrine of the derivation of all forms of life by

gradual modification from earlier and simpler forms or from one rudimentary form." We are told that "the belief in organic evolution, including the appearance of man, for the overwhelming majority of scientific men has passed out of the stage of hypothesis and has become the working theory of science." But we are convinced that this theory is still in the stage of hypothesis, and will very probably in the course of time pass into the stage of oblivion.

It is true that the great majority of scientists in America still believe in this theory of evolution, but the time will come when they will see a better light and will acknowledge that they have made a great mistake. The scientists of Germany are becoming more and more opposed to the evolutionary theory of descent. One German professor intimates that there can be no evolutionist except he be afflicted with a congenital inability to think clearly, while another says that a believer in the theory of descent must have softening of the brain!

These criticisms of the evolutionary theory do not come from amateurs, but from qualified experts. It is, of course, a question whether we in America should pay any attention to the views of German scientists. Bigoted adherents of the theory of descent might maintain that American scholarship leads the world. But in this connection we may be permitted to mention an incident that occurred several years ago. Dr. James Orr of Glasgow, Scotland, delivered a series of lectures in Chicago on the subject of "Higher Criticism." We heard everyone of his lectures. On one occasion he said that he went to Germany frequently to become acquainted with the latest theories and discoveries in his department of research. He said that all new ideas in science originated in Germany; twenty-five years later they cross the channel and invade England, and fifty years later they arrive in America. A remarkable statement of a Scotch scholar about German science!

We submit that there is now a growing opposition among the scientists of Germany against the evolutionary theory of descent, and in the course of time this opposition will cross the Atlantic and arrive in America. Darwinism has been superseded by the present theory of evolution as a result of the labors of German scientists, and in the not distant future the whole theory of descent will disappear. Dr. Delk calls our attention to the

article on "Evolution" in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*. We would advise all disciples of "modern thought" to read carefully the article on "*Evolutionismus*" in the *Realencyklopaedie fuer protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, edited by Dr. Hauck, the work on which the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia is based.

Several weeks ago we received a letter from Dr. Fleischmann, professor of zoology in the University of Erlangen and one of the leading scientists of Germany. He writes about the theory of evolution as follows: "I reject the theory of descent, because there exists no evidence of its truth. Through my professors I was led to a conviction of its truth and I have been a sincere disciple of this doctrine for about ten years. But gradually I learned through independent zoological investigations that the facts do not agree with this fashionable theory at all. The more deeply I became engaged in the study of anatomical and embryological specimens, collecting my information from the study of objects, not from books, the clearer it became to my mind that the theory of descent is an idea (in the sense of Kant), which does not at all apply to experience. The descent of all the species from one rudimentary form is impossible, because animals are constructed according to widely different types. The organization of an insect is altogether different from that of the vertebrata, a snail differs in its organization absolutely from the Echinodermata. This is the doctrine of the fundamental types, which was developed by Cuvier at the beginning of the nineteenth century. It has not been refuted by the adherents of the theory of descent, but on the contrary is being more and more confirmed by the most advanced researches. Even within a certain division of the animal kingdom, as for instance of the vertebrata, the differences are so great and essential, that nobody can explain in detail, how the body of fishes or the Batrachia had to be changed, so that the anatomy of a reptile-bird-mammal could be produced. All the organs of mammals possess so many peculiar characteristics, that their structure can not be traced back to the structure of reptiles, not to speak of the Batrachia. The history of evolution does not furnish a single proof for the assertion that the higher animals have descended from lower animals. You read this assertion coupled with the high-sounding name of the biogenetic law in all the popular

magazines. But if you ask a reliable and honest embryologist, he will have to answer with me, that the development of every animal shows even in the earliest stages the typical character of the class to which that animal belongs; in other words, the embryo of a bird or of a mammal is from the very beginning a bird or a mammal, never a fish or a worm. Since embryology has failed altogether to furnish any evidence for the theory of descent, the adherents of this doctrine have tried to find anatomical proofs to escape from their predicament. But the attempt is ridiculous. If you examine not only one organ, but the whole complex of all the organs in the living individual, you will understand that every organism forms a fixed and compact whole, whose several parts can not have been begged together from many ancestors. The seductive charm of this false doctrine is very great. I have published my ideas in two books, entitled *The Theory of Descent*, and *The Darwinistic Theory*. At present I am writing a new book, which will bear the title *Descent or Creation?* In this book I am plucking to pieces the deceptive doctrine of descent by a historical and objective description of the contents and the scientific methods of zoology, and trust that soon all will understand how stupid they were when they sold themselves body and soul to the swindling humbug of the theory of evolution."

The most delicate and important question for Christians in connection with the theory of evolution is that in regard to the descent of man. May this theory be applied to man, and if so, in what degree? If we take as our basis the Christian theory of the world, can we, or can we not, believe that the formation of man was the result of a natural evolutionary process? The question is a very difficult one, chiefly from the fact that it is not a simple, but a very complicated problem. Not only are the natural sciences concerned, but theology asserts her right to decide in what way man came into being; and within the domain of the natural sciences, psychology, the science of mind, claims also a right to express an opinion on the subject.

As a matter of fact man is not merely an animal. Whoever recognizes an essential difference between man and beast and regards the intellectual soul of man as his most important part, will acknowledge that in investigating the descent and origin of man, the chief question concerns his higher and not his lower

nature. Therefore we believe ourselves justified in saying that psychology is of chief importance among the natural sciences when they are called upon to account for the origin of man. Now psychology tells us that the soul of man is not only essentially different from the soul of an animal, but is a simple spiritual being. Such a being cannot in its very nature develop out of something else; it can come into existence only by way of creation. Therefore man as a whole cannot have been produced from any animal form by way of purely natural development.

According to the Biblical account of creation God created man in a way peculiar to man. We read that God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living soul. It is plain that breathing in the soul is only a symbolical expression for creating the soul of man.

What are we to say about the formation of the human body from earth? The Church has never promulgated any definite decision as to the nature of the substance employed by God in the creation of man. Theologians, however, have consistently maintained that the human body was formed of inanimate matter. Perhaps this is all that need be said on the theological side of the question.

Passing now to the scientific side of it let us at the outset emphasize the fact that the natural sciences, as long as they limit themselves to their proper sphere of investigation, are perfectly free to discuss the origin of man. The assured results of theology need serve them only as an external standard, for one truth cannot contradict another. If science discovers an indubitable truth, theologians will accept it. All Lutheran theologians will vouch for the accuracy of this statement.

What scientific proofs are there of the descent of man from beasts, as far as his body is concerned? Adherents of the theory of descent have usually pointed out two chief classes of proofs, the zoological and the paleontological. It is impossible here to deal with the enormous mass of facts presented to us for consideration. Under the heading of zoology, we must first refer to comparative morphology, as far as it is concerned with the question. It tells us that the human body is that of the most highly developed mammal and it shows us many resemblances between man and other mammals in the formation of the skeleton, of



certain organs and of the nervous system. It would not occur to any scientist to deny that these facts lend a certain amount of probability to the theory of man's descent from beasts, but we must not overlook the various differences which comparative morphology reveals as distinguishing man and beast, and specially as marking off man from the higher or anthropoid apes. The differences between the human skeleton and that of an ape are so great that it is impossible simply to ignore them, and we can bridge over the chasm separating the crania of men and apes respectively only by making assumptions that are not justified by facts. To the present day no connecting link has been discovered.

The comparative history of individual evolution has furnished another series of arguments in favor of the descent of man from beasts. This biogenetic principle was developed by Haeckel. According to it the development of the individual is only an abbreviated and partially modified reproduction of the development of the race. Haeckel worked out the application of this principle to man in great detail and tried to prove that man in his embryonic growth passes through thirty stages of development, corresponding to the same number of stages of ancestors, some of which answer to still existing animal forms, but others are purely imaginary and are postulated by Haeckel for the sake of his theory. This argument attracted much attention and found many to support it in popular circles. But recent investigations in comparative morphology and in evolution justify the statement that the biogenetic principle in general cannot be accepted, nor can we sanction its application to man in order to prove his descent from beasts. Professor Hertwig of Berlin has recently made a critical examination of the biogenetic principle and comes to the conclusion that the evolution of the individual is *not* a repetition of that of the race.

Turning now to the arguments in favor of the theory of descent adduced from paleontology, we wish to state that we appreciate fully the zeal with which scientists are carrying on their investigations into the primitive history of the human race. Provided they do so in accordance with scientific procedure, we have no reason at all for protesting. Whatever science reveals we shall accept without reservation, but the case is entirely different with the phantoms of the imagination set forth as facts.

Serious scientists, however, do not present us with such fictions, and in support of this statement we refer to Professor Branco, who delivered a remarkably fine and instructive lecture upon fossil man at the fifth International Zoological Congress at Berlin in 1901. The chief points in this lecture are summed up in the assertion that *we know absolutely no ancestors of the human race*, for all fossil remains of human beings are the remains of genuine *men*, such as we are now. Branco at that time regarded the Neandertal cranium and that of Spy as exceptions, for such was the general opinion in 1901, but now it is certain that these prehistoric crania belonged not to any ancestors of the human race, but to an earlier variety of the human race. Therefore Branco's statement, "We know no ancestors of man," is now still more true than it was in 1901.

In the introduction to a work on the primitive history of man (1904) Professor Schwalbe says: "In no department of natural science has the attempt to draw general conclusions from an aggregate of facts been so much influenced by the subjective opinions of the individual scientist as in the primitive history of mankind. On this subject it has frequently happened that views, based on a few facts, have been regarded as definitely obtained scientific results by those who have not studied the matter closely, because these views have been enunciated with a peculiar assurance." We recognize the value of scientific research and do not reject it in any hostile spirit, but we cannot say as much for the attempt to represent the descent of man from beasts as a conclusively proved fact, as is done by the adherents of modern evolutionistic thought.

How will Christian evolutionists explain the first three chapters of the Bible? The first chapter of the Bible makes a sharp distinction between the domains of the dry land and the sea and the inhabitants of both domains are created independently of each other. Furthermore we read that God made the beast of the earth *after his kind*, and cattle *after their kind*, and everything that creepeth upon the earth *after his kind*. This means that God created the different species and here we find no trace of the doctrine of the transmutation of species. Of course Dr. Delk will here apply principles of exegesis similar to those employed by him in his explanation of the fall. But on such a

principle of interpretation all the words of the Holy Scripture may be turned to almost any meaning.

We are firmly convinced that we need not accept the theory of evolution, the dominant idea of modern thought opposed to the fundamental truths of Christianity, in order to keep in touch with our age and pass as modernly educated men. We reject this theory primarily because we think clearly and reason logically. Christianity and science are not natural enemies, but natural friends. Human knowledge and the old orthodox, evangelical faith are not opposed to each other. Both are streams flowing from one original source, from one and the same infinite, eternal and divine wisdom. This wisdom cannot contradict itself, although it may address us now in one and now in another language. Hence we are firmly convinced that there can be no real contradiction between orthodox Lutheran theology and the modern mind.

*Forest Park, Chicago.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

*The Constructive Quarterly* (Mar.) presents the existing "Attitude of German Protestant Theology to the Bible" in an article by Professor Adolf von Schlatter, of Tübingen. He traces the course of events which put the Bible to a test in its contact with the civil, social and individual life in Germany. The connection of Church and State and the use of the Bible to substantiate this union as well as to prove all manner of dogma naturally alienated many from the Book that seemed to enforce an unreal authority. The coming in of the historical and critical method seemed for a time to lower the authority of the Bible. So also the growth of religious individualism worked against submission to the Scriptures. But this is all changed. The critical studies of the historicity of the Scriptures have given them a substantial basis; and the untenableness of a personal religious experience without some objective authority has become apparent. Moreover, a proper view of Jesus, who spoke as a King, discovers that he is no tyrant, but one endowed with divine power and one who reveals God's will as Grace. In practical life the return to the Bible was demanded ethically by the need of a moral standard, which can be found nowhere else. An ethic is needed which affords strength and produces life; and such an ethic must itself be the production of life. "Through communion with Jesus the will in us is roused to surrender itself to the Divine Will, and so to do the work the Divine Will portions out to us in our concrete position to-day."

"To the observer in the distance," says Schlatter, "it must appear as if the sway of the Bible over the German Protestant Church is seriously shaken and exposed to great fluctuation. This thought is not only found in foreign literature, but it also agitates many who are in the thick of German life. But to clearer sight it is evident that the Bible is the fixed point which calls forth, dominates and draws to itself our religious history.

\* \* \* If we look at the general course of our religious history we

must acknowledge that the religious power and authority of the Scriptures have stood the surprising test magnificently in modern German religious history."

In the same number of *The Constructive Quarterly*, Professor Michael Maher, S.J., of Stonyhurst College, gives "A Catholic Account of Faith." He says, "In the view of the Catholic Church, this faith which is so essential, which comes of hearing, which requires a preacher who has been sent, which assures us that the world was created by God, that its Creator exists, and will reward those that seek Him, and which is necessary in order that all may be well pleasing to God, is not a mere prehensible act of the will, not a blind instinct, not a religious sense or relish, not confidence in the gratuitous mercy of God, but *an intellectual assent to testimony, an acceptance or embracing by the understanding of revealed truth.*" (The italics are ours. This last clause gives the Roman Catholic view of faith).

The nature of faith is explained (1) as a judicial act of the understanding, an assent of the intellect to a trust proposed for its acceptance; (2) The motive of assent in this act—in technical language the *formal object* of faith—is the Authority of God revealing this truth. Submission, however, to the Word of God, which "contains supernatural mysteries above our comprehension and moral precepts repugnant to our lower nature" is humiliating to our human mind. Yet such submission of intellect is the very essence of Faith; (3) "Since the mystery or revealed truth proposed for our credence is not intrinsically evident, but on the contrary opposed to ordinary experience, it is only by the exercise of the will that the intellect can be brought to acquiesce. The function of the will here is to direct the attention to the sovereign and infallible authority of God, which requires and justifies acceptance of the proposed doctrine, and then in view of this consideration to impel the understanding to a dutiful intelligent assent. \* \* The assent of faith thus brought about by the will is therefore *free, in the fullest sense.* And because free, it is capable of *merit.*" (4) Finally this assent to revealed truths is an action not in the natural but in the supernatural order, and can only be exercised efficiently towards the attainment of man's supernatural end by the aid of *grace*—a gratuitous gift of God. This grace enlightens the intellect and strengthens the will to embrace the mystery. Faith, accordingly, is not a natural con-

viction however strong resulting from reflection. This grace is a special gift of God which can neither be evolved by intellectual labor nor merited by works; but it may be prayed for.

As faith is the assent to revealed truth, it is evident that we should seek for credentials establishing the Christian religion as a divine revelation. "How do we know that God has revealed the truth in question?" The argumentative evidence is found in the (1) fulfilment of prophecy by Christ (2) and in His miracles. To these should be added two groups of *Motiva Credibilitatis* or two stages in the development of evidence. The first group includes the history of the people, so unique in all respects; and also the New Testament story, especially the life of Christ. This group was entirely convincing to the first generation of proselytes. The second stage or group of evidence is found in the supernatural life of the Church. For twenty centuries the Church has endured in spite of its lowly origin and many hindrances and has maintained unity of faith, of discipline and of government. But how is all this Revelation to be understood? How is the average Christian to attain to certain knowledge? "The answer of the Catholic is: The definition by the Church or the Head of the Church, of a truth as contained in the Revelation affords me that certainty." The General Councils have given proper interpretations of Revelation; but as these Councils can assemble only at long intervals, the providence of God has provided other means of deciding questions of doctrine and this is found in "the infallibility of the Pope, whenever he authoritatively decides a doctrine of faith for the whole Church."

The "genesis of faith in the individual Christian" is usually found in the instruction which the child receives from parent or teacher. Hence the importance of Catholic schools, which are so necessary that the Church "simply cannot surrender them." When the child grows up and perchance travels he will be strengthened in his faith by observing that everywhere his Church is the same as it was in his home. He will discover a marvelous unity always and everywhere. And when sarcasm would cast reflections upon papal infallibility, he turns and reflects that two thousand years of history are back of his faith, and he is comforted by this fact in the conviction that "he has behind him a mass of intellectual testimony, a weight of moral

authority and a supernatural guarantee that he is in assured possession of the Word of God who cannot deceive."

As to the things that are to be believed, the Catholic Church holds that Christ has committed the *depositum fidei* to an Apostolate, a living teaching authority to whom He promised the assistance of the Holy Spirit. This deposit of faith consists "in the oral and written tradition of the Church." The believer must receive the interpretation of the Church "as a learner, not as a critic." His attitude must be that of obedience. "This may be a hard saying,—for the twentieth century. But it is not the only one in the New Testament. It does not lie with \* \* \* a member of the Church to determine what shall be the truths of faith."

The foregoing extract from a competent and sincere Roman Catholic scholar gives evidence that the Romanism of to-day is essentially that of the Reformation period, and emphasizes the utter hopelessness of a reunion of Protestant and Catholic. The radical misconception of faith as an intellectual assent to Catholic doctrine marks the line of cleavage between the two. Faith, in its essence, is a heartfelt trust and not mere assent. The above writer does not speak of justification—the doctrine of a standing and falling Church; but his definition of faith implies the ancient error concerning justification. The surrender of the right of private judgment, the authority of tradition and the infallibility of the Pope—which are boldly affirmed—are simply the repetition of claims, which no Protestant can tolerate.

---

In the January *London Quarterly Review* Principal Forsythe in an able article on "The Man and the Message," speaks of the importance of "doctrine" in preaching thus:

"The Church must be dogmatic if it is to do the Church's work. It always has been. And those in closest touch with its redemptive action know it must be. A sentimental Savior cannot do anything with a hardened sinner; nor an ethical gospel reclaim a passion-bitten, sin-stung, and deadly poisoned world. Christianity has always tended to theology, doctrine, and dogma. And that because not otherwise can the living, redemptive, regenerative Christ of the New Testament come to His own. Grace has always gravitated to dogma. \* \* \* The dogma does not do Christ's work, but you cannot publish or apply Christ's work



without it. It cannot be severed from personal life (His or ours), but it is more than personal effect. It is not a substitute for Christ's person, but it is indispensable to grasp and tell what Christ is and does. Christianity is the practical establishment or restoration of a sinful race's communion with God. It is the recreation of a soul and the setting up of a kingdom. It means (centrally, if not in every case) a hearty and passionate turning from sin and to God's grace. It is a great agitation in us. And therefore it rouses much question from thought about its certainties, as surely as it stirs the action of heart and will towards them when we are sure. Heart and will crave for stability and knowledge. \* \* \* Christianity is dogmatic or nothing. Men may come and men may go, preachers rise and fall, churches are gathered and churches are scattered, movements wax and fashions wane, but the age long and sublime confession in Christ of a gracious holy God, whether spoken as a theme or developed like a symphony endures in memorable thought and mood, filling amply the vast mind and golden mouth of the Church. It is the certificate of the wealth of its possession in Christ. It is a monument of its power and freedom, and not a millstone to drown it in our choppy modern sea."

---

*The Reformed Church Review* (Jan.) in an article by the Rev. Wm. H. Erb laments the lack of "Uniformity of Public Worship" in the Reformed Church. "Ministers, because of the freedom of our denomination (or rather laxity) with reference to the order of public worship, formulate their own outline or framework for public service. These forms are arranged frequently in accordance with personal ideas and fancy, or æsthetical promptings, regardless of Church and denominational life. \* \* \* The effort made in the past to give our denomination an order of service brought about it is true, an unpleasant controversy. \* \* That controversy \* \* has been overruled by Providence for some good, and has revealed to the Church her lack of unity of denominational spirit and life. These two liturgies have been a factor in arousing the various tendencies of our denomination to the fact that our denominational life and spirit must be expressed in a corresponding formal order of worship. Whenever the directory or the order is used unaltered and as recommended or permitted by the Church authorities, they have checked the two

tendencies, the so-called high and low, and have kept the congregations evangelical and churchly. Our denomination has grown in grace and in knowledge during the last fifty years. \* \*

Variety is not always the sign of life; neither is uniformity the sign of lifelessness, as some contend. Uniformity is not destructive, but rather constructive. Variety may be simply confusion and end in chaos, and uniformity may be dignity and create solemnity. Uniformity is a sign of union, which is strength, and by union (as in grafting) is created life and unity."

---

In *The American Journal of Theology* (Jan.) the Rev. Charles W. Gilkey discusses "The Function of the Church in Modern Society." He speaks first of the change of attitude from criticism to sympathy on the part of many serious-minded men; and in the Church itself there are many new signs of life. The social workers, who may have hitherto ignored the Church, realize that over two hundred thousand congregations with thirty-five million members have a high social calling. Everywhere the existence and the insistence of religion is acknowledged. Some hold that "while religion may abide, the Church has outlived its usefulness. Whether this is actually the case is precisely our question."

1. The permanent functions of the Church in human society are the following: (1) The support of the otherwise morally and religiously insufficient individual in his higher life. We are socially interdependent. Comparatively few can stand without the encouragement and example of others. "The human universe, like the solar system and the whole cosmos of which it is a part, is held in place and swung in orderly and dependable orbit by the influence of the individual members on each other; gravitation is in this sense a spiritual as well as a physical force—and in both realms is fundamental and essential." (2) "The second permanent function of the Church is the transmission from generation to generation of Christian life and experience in all its quickening power, and especially of those life-giving and never-failing spiritual experiences which the Church has made accessible to the world in the Bible and in the person of Jesus Christ." The Bible has always been like an overflowing vessel of living water and the Church has ever been the channel

through which has poured down through the ages the inexhaustible stream from which the vessel was originally filled. In the Church the power and presence of Jesus Christ are most fully realized, and the Church has ever been the sphere of this activity and has always proclaimed him to mankind. No mission can compare with witnessing to His life and atoning death. (3) The third function is "To relate religion vitally to the ordinary life of all sorts and conditions of men, at all times and places of their existence." It is the function of the Church to bring the real blessings of religion into the common everyday life of men, through its regular services Sunday and weekday, as well as in every manner of its great work. The Church is not to be ritualistic or revivalistic. These manifestations may be compared to the old-fashioned cylindrical boiler in which the great mass of water is heated very slowly. The Church should rather be like the modern tubular boiler, penetrating the whole mass of water, thus bearing the divine fire straight to the heart and out through all the ranges of human life. (4) "The fourth function of the Church is a co-operative attempt to realize an essentially social ideal." "The Christian ideal for human life is a social ideal, the Christian gospel a social gospel; and therefore that ideal can be realized and that gospel effectively preached only through a *society*."

2. "Special Functions of the Church in Modern Society."

(1). The call comes to the Church in our modern largely commercialized and highly driven life "to witness to the reality and power of things unseen and eternal, and to make the busy modern man, whether capitalist or laborer, realize their supreme importance." (2). The Church must "cultivate and sensitize the social conscience. She alone among all our human institutions exists for the specific purpose of making men realize that they are brothers, children of a common Father in one great human family." (3). The Church should embrace the opportunity for "the definite promotion of the common welfare at the next point to be gained." "The Church is or ought to be at any moment the most sensitive and responsive part of the body politic—the keenest surface of its conscience to feel the newest social danger, the strong cutting edge of its common will to press through obstacles on the higher social attainments. She is or ought to be a permanently organized force of social minute-men, ready to

rush into any unexpected breach in the walls of our civilization and to hold it temporarily against the invading enemies of our human welfare until new defenses can be built; ready to dart ahead and seize any commanding points of social vantage that will facilitate or protect the advance of humanity on its long march to higher and better things."

*The Hibbert Journal* (Jan.) opens with an article by F. C. S. Schiller of Oxford, Eng., on "Eugenics and Politics." He defines eugenics as the application of biology to social life, a sort of a social hygiene on a large scale. The world in its habits and traditions are profoundly anti-eugenical, and it is hard to convince how urgently its Augean stables should be cleansed with scientific disinfectants, not only that it may progress but even survive. It is a common delusion, which ought to be dispelled that the human race is bound to progress in spite of everything. But there is nothing in the constitution of the universe that guarantees the perpetual progress of human societies. The predictions of Malthus have not come to pass, but he was not necessarily mistaken. The race has forseen the danger and has so far averted it. But life is more than mere living. It cannot be estimated by mere quantity with an entire disregard of quality. It is not true that one man's life is as good as another's and that all men are equal. There is such a thing as natural nobility. Some bodies are stronger and fairer than others, and some minds ampler and happier than others. It is better to be born a Plato than an idiot. It is, therefore, worth while to get for oneself the healthy, strong body and the noble mind. This is a fundamental axiom on which the appeal of eugenics rests. Society must protect itself against the breeding of the wrong sort of men—weaklings, wasters, fools, criminals and lunatics. If it does not it is a biological failure and dooms itself to extinction.

The race has not done what is biologically right. It has made no effort at improvement or to prevent degeneration. It has persistently indulged in a number of anti-eugenical practices. War is one of these, for thereby it has sacrificed the most vigorous portion of the population. The decadence of Spain and Portugal is most probably to be traced to the constant drain of the most enterprising men to America, Africa, and India.

Slavery is even less eugenic than war, for it enables the in-

ferior race to survive under the rule of the conquerors, who often proceed to eliminate themselves by internecine warfare. The conquerors usually die out and the vanquished take their place.

The decline of the birth rate in the upper-classes from four and one-half to one per marriage means that society sheds one-half of its best people in every generation, and supplies the vacancy with the offspring of inferior classes whose families still average more than seven. Moreover, the evil is aggravated by the postponement of marriage in the middle-classes, thus reducing the number of children. The result will be the elimination of the middle-class, and the survival of the unfit and the defective.

These things threaten national calamity. It is said that the State of New York already spends from one-seventh to one-fifth of its revenues on the support of defectives, and there is no reason why it may not have to spend the whole of it if the social policy which has led to this result is persisted in. To whom shall we look to make good the gaps in the upper ranks of society in which guiding minds must be found to provide organization and direction? These men are not to be found in adequate numbers. We must look to the family for the supply of capable men and not to the individual nor to the State. Individualism and Socialism are both profoundly wrong, and dangerous to human survival. The family is the only mechanism which human wit has ever contrived that has attractiveness enough to bind the individual's caprice to travel in regular orbits, and to build up an orderly society out of the gravitation of social units. The family lies at the roots both of the school and of the factory and of the Church. If the State wants good citizens it must keep the family in good condition.

Our author forcees the possibility that China and Japan, both of which regard the family as the essential unit of social life, may outstrip and survive European nations.

The fatal omission in the above discussion is that Christianity is not even mentioned. True Christians according to the highest Authority are the salt of the earth.

---

In the same number of the *Hibbert Journal*, Professor Dr. Wm. A. Curtis of Aberdeen University, gives "A Scottish Presbyterian Estimate of the Value of Confessions of Faith." The

confessional problem in Presbyterian Scotland is pressing and vital, on account of the restored fellowship and possible union of the two largest Churches, the Church of Scotland and the United Free Church. The union must be upon a basis of doctrine, honorable to both and lasting. Each has had its chastening experiences in matters of faith. "The trial for heresy of Edward Irving, John McLeod Campbell, and William Robertson Smith, a trio of prophet, saint and scholar, have taught us much—about ourselves as well as them." Controversies have been educational. The Churches have had a large experience. Is it too much to hope that there may emerge a National Church worthy of the name? But how about the doctrinal testimony? What place shall be given to the Westminster Confession, which is professed by neither Church *simpliciter et totaliter*? It can neither be surrendered or implicitly accepted. . A dogmatic symbol in whose composition the best minds in the whole English-speaking Presbyterianism had co-operated, ought to be earnestly desired.

The value of the ancient confessions is inestimable. They record the religious experience, and the consensus of God's people in the past. "They epitomize for us the otherwise incomprehensible study of Christian doctrine, furnishing us with an invaluable conspectus of dogma, orderly and condensed." They must be historically studied and understood. They reflect the prevailing sentiment of their time. The more closely we study their historical setting the more deeply are we impressed with them "as noble monuments of Christian handiwork, a credit to their authors and their time, and an honor to the religion that begot them."

Articles of Faith have a value for religious life. Catechisms have entered and moulded the minds of the young, and confessional manuals have met a profound want in the soul. There may be an element of danger when they are accepted as the sum total of religion; but the motive behind them is noble. Faith is fundamental in religion. *What* we believe is vital, only less vital than *in whom* we believe. Confession is an essentially evangelistic act. It is the utterance of good news. Like a flag, it is a symbol of the social, the unselfish, the unifying element in religion. Yet doctrinal standards are liable to disintegrate in time because of elaborateness and minute detail, which may have to be revised in the light of scholarship and experience.

The relation of Confession of Faith to the Holy Scriptures is anything but easy to define. They are professedly based on Scripture, but the Romanists and the Socinians appeal to the same passages with quite a different result. "The Evangelical Confessions all defer to Scripture, and are content to regard themselves as but summaries of it." They are manuals of Biblical doctrine and have promoted the study of the Bible; and yet they sometimes supplanted the Bible as test of orthodoxy. "No summary, however ingenious, will ever replace for religious ends the venerable Book. To it the Christian intellect and conscience will never renounce their sacred right of appeal."

The relation of Confessions to Church discipline is the thorniest portion of the whole subject. It is clearly a great advantage to a Church to have a common body of doctrine which expresses a common conviction and which guarantees that the pastor will teach the truth accredited. "But to enforce them legally in a hard and fast way is unchristian and unwise." No one age can arrogate to itself a monopoly of definition. "If Faith has hands with which to cling, it has also feet with which to move forward." Confessions are ill-served by those who read them narrowly. Seasons of revision, like seasons of revival are not to be forecast.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.

History is making in the Church of Germany. Events of far-reaching consequence are taking place. A very unusual movement is afoot and some of the friends of the Church are profoundly alarmed about the stability of her present organization. The masses of the people have begun to withdraw from the Church. This has been brought about by the systematic efforts of the enemies of the Church. These enemies do not conceal their identity. They operate openly and above board. Their avowed purpose is to embarrass the Church by inducing her adherents to withdraw their membership and to place themselves outside of her borders and beyond her influence.

These antagonists of the Church are well organized in their propaganda. They seem determined to accomplish their purpose of completely undermining the Church. Their efforts are systematic and persistent and they have been meeting with ter-



rible success. By hundreds and by thousands the people have been withdrawing their membership from the Church thus aligning themselves with her enemies. To many of the servants of the Church in the Fatherland the movement appears truly alarming. It seems fraught with grave danger for the old faith, for it seems to remove all possibility for the conservation of historic Christianity in Germany. But seen in the perspective of the observer on the American side of the Atlantic the movement does not necessarily appear either dangerous or disastrous. It does indeed mark the beginning of a vast and important change. The old order is about to be swept away. The established Church will be forced to give up her unholy alliance with the State. But a new order and a better organization will come into existence. The faithful will retain their faith and go on towards perfection. The Church will no longer be the Church of Germany but will have become the Church in Germany, and she will have entered upon the brightest period of her history. Seen aright the present march of events is a blessing rather than a bane and the approaching crisis is full of hope.

But the events that are now transpiring will undoubtedly mark an epoch in the history of the German Church. They need to be set forth here, however briefly, because they constitute easily the most absorbing topic in current religious thought in the Fatherland. We must observe, first of all, what is involved in the process of withdrawing from the Church. Then we must take a brief survey of the extent of the present movement of withdrawals. Thirdly, we must seek to analyze the complicated causes of the movement, for this is exceedingly important to any intelligent understanding of the significance and possible bearings of the case. And finally, we may draw some conclusions concerning the probable effects of this movement.

#### THE PROCESS OF WITHDRAWAL.

In Germany practically every person belongs to the Church. That means that nearly every person, unless he is a Jew by race and by faith, has been baptized and confirmed into one of the recognized Christian Churches, Lutheran, Reformed, or Catholic. Before he was old enough to choose for himself or to offer objections each man's Church membership was determined for him

by his baptism. He went the way of his parents. Of course there are some exceptions to this general rule, but the persons who are not members of some Church were, up to the present, very rare indeed, less than one per cent. of all citizens. In 1910 out of a total population of 64,925,993, 61 59-100 per cent. were Evangelical [i. e. Lutheran or Reformed], 36 69-100 per cent. were Roman Catholic, 95-100 of 1 per cent. were Israelites, 44-100 of 1 per cent. were Sectarians, leaving only 33-100 of 1 per cent. who belonged to other persuasions or made no profession at all. Thus few more than 200,000 in all walks and ages of life could be classified as unchurched. And they were regarded very much as a person is regarded in America who has not been naturalized. They were debarred from many of the most precious privileges of their fellow-men.

For Germany is a country with State-Churchism. And this fact gives color to nearly all religious relationships and events in that country and enters into a great many political relationships and events. It has hitherto generally been taken for granted that the citizen of the State is also a member of the Church, if not a member of one of the established Churches or of the Jewish faith, then at least a member of one of those recognized religious communities called sects. The individual who effected a change of creed by exchanging his membership in the Church for membership in one of the sects might be regarded as less loyal in his citizenship and less worthy of confidence than the average man, but the individual who was bold enough to go entirely creedless by remaining outside of the Church or by withdrawing from the Church after he had been entered was regarded as positively peculiar and an object of suspicion and disdain. In the taking of the census, or the collecting of the taxes, or in any public accounting, such an individual was always a source of embarrassment to the public clerk and to the police, who knew not how to classify the man without a creed. The young man whom his father had failed to have baptized, when he came to his military service was like a white raven among his fellows and became at once the object of their sport and ridicule until at length the chaplain succeeded in having him baptized.

Church membership is everywhere presupposed in the average citizen. It is necessary for the full enjoyment of all the privileges of citizenship. Parents who no longer hold the faith of

their fathers and who do not believe in the religious efficacy of the sacraments and ceremonies of the Church, but who for various reasons have not themselves withdrawn from the Church, will nevertheless have their children baptized and confirmed into the established Church lest they be discriminated against in the schools and elsewhere. Thus the close union of Church and State has so complicated religious affairs with political and social affairs that the vast host of citizens are practically born into the Church. They come into the Church without their own choice and with no chance to object, and the way out is not easy. And thus from the very nature of the case this condition of affairs has been handed down substantially unchanged from generation to generation with no hope of relief for the future. The man who wishes to place himself or his family outside of the Church must go through the formal procedure of withdrawal and not a few hindrances are encountered in the course of this procedure.

The candidate for withdrawal must first signify his intention in a written declaration addressed to the clerk of the court under whose jurisdiction he lives. The court then informs the congregation to which the applicant belongs and efforts are made to dissuade him from the tragic step. He is usually summoned to the parsonage but he is not obliged to obey the summons and if he does not obey it he may be visited either by the pastor himself or by one of his assistants. If he still persists in his determination to withdraw he must repeat his intention punctually four weeks after his original declaration, otherwise the original declaration is void. This time he must appear in person before the officials of State. Here again an effort may be made to dissuade him, but if he still insists upon his withdrawal he pays a fee of 92 cents and then he is free. From his Church tax, however, he is not freed until the second year following the year of his withdrawal. The head of a family may withdraw his minor children, but unless his wife withdraws personally for herself he must continue to pay one-half of the Church tax. These are the regulations of Prussia, and Prussia is the chief scene of the withdrawals. In Saxony the difficulties are even greater because the applicant for withdrawal must deal directly with the pastor and the Church officials instead of the court, and this of itself serves to prevent many from applying because they feel themselves socially and intellectually inferior to the clergy and there-

fore unequal to the debate which will necessarily follow upon their application for withdrawal. But then in Saxony the fee for withdrawal is only one mark. Very similar to these regulations in Prussian and Saxony are the regulations in the other German States.

But these steps which we have enumerated are merely the formal difficulties in the way of withdrawal from the Church. The social and political disadvantages which result from such a step are a less ponderable quantity but certainly far more weighty in deterring men from such action. It is not fashionable in society circles to withdraw from the Church, for such a step is likely to place a person in a class with the uncultured laborer. The man who withdraws risks his social standing if he has any. Then, too, consideration for one's relatives often prevents withdrawal. There is danger also that the children of those who have withdrawn will suffer a disadvantage in the school. Moreover, the vast army of government employees, in post office, railroad, and so forth, are in danger of losing their positions or their right to promotion if they do not belong to the Church. And finally, withdrawal from the Church means forfeiture of all Churchly ceremonies. This is generally regarded as a serious loss, even by those who are religiously indifferent, especially the forfeiture of Churchly marriage, of Churchly burial, and of the right to be buried in the regular cemetery. The deterrents from withdrawal are many.

#### THE EXTENT OF THE PRESENT MOVEMENT.

But despite the many hindrances and discouragements that must be encountered by those who seek to withdraw from the State-Church, such withdrawals are taking place to-day in great numbers. For almost a decade such withdrawals have taken place sporadically here and there in Prussia and Saxony as determined by local causes and special occasions. Before that time there had been a considerable number of changes in Church relationship and many withdrawals to the sects, but there had been very few withdrawals to no religious community whatever. During the three years from 1906 to 1908 perhaps 8000 would be a liberal estimate for the number of those who withdrew each year without identifying themselves with any other religious

body. Then in 1909 the number of such withdrawals reached the high-water mark up to the present year. Very special efforts were made to secure withdrawals that year and for the whole Empire they totaled 17,754. But almost immediately the numbers began to decline. In 1910 they fell to 12,296 and in 1911 to 12,058. But during the past few months a veritable movement of the masses in that direction has set in and the *Kirchenaustrittsbewegung* is to-day a common topic of conversation both in religious and in political circles.

Accurate and complete figures concerning the extent of the present movement it is impossible to obtain as yet. Naturally since the movement is accompanied with so much rancor and animosity against the authorities, the officers of State are in no haste to gather the statistical material which will show the success of the movement. Nor are the Church organizations anxious to publish the number of their losses. Moreover it is still too early for a comprehensive tabulation of the results. But a few isolated figures will suggest the probable extent of the movement. Concerning one of the district courts in the city of Berlin it is reported that during the month of December 12 judges and 38 actuaries were kept busy with the declarations of intended withdrawals. Many hundreds of persons crowded the waiting-rooms and the corridors of the building for hours at a time seeking an opportunity to submit their declarations. Of another district court in the same city it is authentically reported that as many as 1300 withdrawals were effected in one day. For the entire city of Greater Berlin it is officially stated that from the 1st of December to the 23d about 17,000 withdrawals were made and on the 28th of that month an additional 8000 followed. Of course the movement is stronger in Berlin than anywhere else, but even so it would perhaps be a safe estimate to say that over the Empire as a whole the total number of withdrawals from the Church during the past half-year must reach the hundreds of thousands.

And the end is not yet. The movement is still on the increase. It is well organized in its propaganda against the Church and those who have organized it claim that it has not yet begun to manifest its real strength. The Monists and the Socialists have joined their forces in the agitation and they are preparing for still greater achievements along this line. They resist every effort of the Church to withstand the onslaught. For

instance, shortly before Christmas the two General Superintendents of Berlin called upon their pastors to set aside Sunday, January 11th, as a general Church Day, for the purpose of warning their members against withdrawal by reminding them of the great benefits they receive in the Christian Church. Thereupon the Committee of the Monists, whose special business it is to instigate the withdrawals, called upon all their followers and all kindred organizations to hold counter-meetings on that same day for the purpose of opposing the "Prussian reaction" by arousing the people to withdraw from "the police Church." The aim was to secure 10,000 withdrawals on that one day but the Church forces rallied encouragingly and only about one-fourth of that number were actually secured during the day. Nevertheless the fact that such a counter-effort was made shows the tactics of the Church's enemies and indicates somewhat of the spirit and determination of the forces behind this movement.

The significance of the present movement, therefore, lies in its thorough organization and in the fact that it has opened against the established Church a war to the death. Herein it differs materially from all former attacks upon the Church, which were scattered and temporary. At the center of the movement stands a committee of Monists which calls itself the "Committee of the Creedless" (*Komitee Konfessionslos*). Prominent among the members of this committee are Wilhelm Ostwald, Ernst Haeckel, and Arthur Drews. Concerning the activities and methods of the Committee a considerable literature has already arisen. Suffice it to say here that this Committee has been in existence since February, 1911, was officially endorsed by the League of Monists in September, 1911, has a comfortable treasury, has its own publications with skillful editors, and in many other respects employs the missionary methods of the Church herself, in organization, in sermons, in public discussions, and in the use of printed literature. Its avowed purpose is to disable and destroy the established Church so as to make room for freedom of thought and expression, for unhampered conscience, and, incidentally, for the monistic view of the world. "Our fight is against the organization of the State-Church. We want to tear down the old building. Outside it looks massive and solid and beautifully adorned but inside it is completely decayed. We want to tear it down because new buildings have arisen all

around it and their view is shut off by the old." This end they seek to accomplish by securing multitudinous withdrawals from the Church, and all their activities are bent in that direction. The aim is to wreck the old building by hollowing it out so that it will fall of its own great weight.

This committee was endorsed by the German League of Free Thinkers in May, 1912, and by the International League of Free Thinkers at Munich in September, 1912. Last January the Creedless and the Free Thinkers together with the Congregation of Free Religion in Berlin formed a co-operative union under the title "United Committees for Withdrawal from the Church." They expect to hold a national conference in the near future.

From the beginning of this agitation it was expected that the Socialist Party would ally itself with the other enemies of the Church in this movement. Prominent Socialists expressed themselves in favor of such a course. But this expectation has not been fulfilled. The national executive committee of the party has recently taken official action declaring that the Socialist Party as such will have nothing to do with the present agitation for withdrawal from the State-Church. They insist upon maintaining the old party principle of absolute neutrality in religious and ecclesiastical affairs. "Religion is a private matter." And they refuse to place the party organization in the service of the present movement. But this declaration is grounded in pure motives of plain political prudence. It does not alter the fact that the socialistic democracy is the very strength and back-bone of the present movement against the Church and that the vast majority of withdrawals are effected by people in the laboring classes, themselves members of the Socialist Party. The Monists have learned by experience that they must depend upon the ranks of the Socialists for their material in this propaganda. Influential individuals among the Socialists co-operate quite actively with the Committee of the Monists. Liebknecht, the leader of the Socialists, and Professor Ostwald, the Chairman of the Committee, address the same gatherings. The Monists frequently employ such socialistic slogans as "The Strike of the Masses against the State-Church," or "Boycott the Church." And Paul Göhre, another leading Socialist, calls upon every Socialist as an individual to use the present agitation as an occasion for a personal decision for or against the Church. If he



find that he has no taste for religion and no real need for the Church, then let him withdraw now. But if he find himself inclined towards the exercise of religion and towards the Church, then let him remain in the established Church and seek its reformation and modernization from within. The practical effect of such advice is greatly to encourage the withdrawals. The ranks of the Socialists must therefore be regarded as the chief recruiting-ground for the army of the enemy in the present campaign against the Church. Many of the officers and not a few of the privates come from among the Monists and the Free Thinkers, but the chief bulwark and the main strength of the movement come from the masses of the Socialists.

#### THE CAUSES OF THE MOVEMENT.

When we seek to analyze the causes of these multitudinous withdrawals from the Church we must distinguish between the deeper causes and the more immediate occasions of the movement. The various forms of instigation and agitation that are being employed to-day are only the occasions of the movement. They are not the real causes. The isolated movements for withdrawal which had taken place before this present movement began may be ascribed chiefly to economic causes. The growth of industry brought about movements of population and these in turn broke up the confessional uniformity of the various districts of the country, thus leading to numerous changes of Church relationship. The many transfers of Church membership to the sects may also be traced to economic causes, for these sects have always flourished best where industrial and economic problems abound.

But these most recent withdrawals cannot be traced so directly to the operation of economic forces. Indirectly, it is true, the economic situation has helped to bring about the movement. Undoubtedly the economic depression that prevails in certain classes of society has had something to do with the present movement by stimulating the chronic dissatisfaction with conditions in general and with the present order of things. Undoubtedly, too, many of those who are now withdrawing from the Church are impelled by a desire to be relieved of the Church tax which they are obliged to pay so long as they continue their membership with

the Church. And this is a motive that is frequently appealed to by the popular agitators in their public harangues. But this tax is so small, especially for the class of persons who are most active in withdrawing, and relief from this tax is so largely counter-balanced by the fee that must be paid for withdrawal, that this cannot be the sole nor even the chief cause of the present movement. No, the real underlying causes of this remarkable movement must be sought far beneath the surface of events. The withdrawals of the multitude are but the superficial manifestation of the malignant cancer that has long been feeding upon the antiquated ecclesiastical system of German State-Churchism. We are merely witnessing to-day the external consummation of a breach that has long been complete far within. External remedies will not effect a cure. Radical measures will be necessary. For the real causes of the movement are at least three in number, religious, ecclesiastical, and political.

In the first place, there is wide-spread irreligion among the masses of the people. This indifference to religion is probably no greater among the Germans than among the other peoples of Christendom. In fact, discriminating observers have during recent years discerned many signs of a religious renaissance in Germany. But even so there is still to be felt a generous strain of ungodliness in the Fatherland. And Germany differs from most other countries not in the number of her scoffers nor in the prevalence of her irreligion but in the fact that so much of her irreligious rubbish is found within the pale of the State-Church and there it has a tendency to interfere with the healthful progress of true religion. This religious indifference in itself would not begin to account for the present move away from the Church, but added to the other causes it becomes an important factor.

A vast host of people, still members of the Church, no longer feel the need of Christianity or of any other religion. A great many of them never did feel any such need. They seem to be divested of all religiosity and live entirely in the realm of the natural. This is a fact of common observation everywhere, that the great majority of men are neither deeply religious nor devoutly pious. The causes of this state of affairs are well known. They lie for the most part in the general atmosphere of the times. The natural man is encouraged in his natural state by the modern triumph of the natural sciences and by the growth

of materialistic philosophy and anti-Christian ethics. In Germany this attitude of irreverence and irreligion may be due in part to the lack of vital touch between the Church and her members, but it is due in largest measure to the zealous propaganda of the materialistic philosophers. The destructive works of men like Ernst Haeckel have been popularized and spread far and wide among the people. The Monists, the Free Thinkers, the various advocates of liberal views, have banded themselves together into a variety of leagues and organizations for the purpose of popularizing their revolutionary ideas and of fighting the traditional Christian view of the world. They have thus not only made a decided impression upon the more intelligent classes capable of grasping a philosophy of the world, but it is remarkable to what extent these materialistic ideas have seeped down to the lower strata of society. Here they have joined themselves to an old remnant of rationalism handed down from a previous century, and the combination has wrought wreck and ruin to the faith of many of the common people.

The Church of Germany has not been able to combat these sad conditions as she might have done in other countries. She has not always been able to train her members in active, aggressive religion. As the special agent for the conservation of religion in general and of Christianity in particular she has been under a serious disadvantage. Her baneful union with the State has imposed upon her a whole host of conditions which have made it impossible for her to care for all her members and build them up unto edification and sanctification. Then, too, whenever animosity has been aroused against the Church, whether for ecclesiastical or for political reasons, it always entails a decline in religious faith. Thus from these various causes, Germany has her wide-spread irreligion, and that, too, within the organized Church. This furnishes one of the conditions which upon occasion will lead to a popular movement for withdrawal from the Church. The man who has in heart and conscience really broken with the faith of the Church, needs but an appeal to his sincerity to bring him to the formality of an open break.

The second cause, more important than the first, is of ecclesiastical nature. There is an undoubted animosity to the Church as an organization. This is manifested in almost countless forms. The Committee of the Monists easily gained an audience

when they announced that they proposed to attack the established Church. Even though they had nothing whatever to offer in its stead, the masses listened eagerly to their proposals for a general campaign against the hated institution. The soil was prepared in the wide-spread anti-ecclesiastical spirit. And this spirit dare not be taken to mean irreligion or even opposition to the Christian religion but only opposition to the Church as organized in Germany. The Church is severely discredited and every day she is the object of passionate denunciation. We can but briefly recount the reasons for this popular animosity to the Church.

Ever since the Reformation the established Church has been the means employed by the State for the authoritative training up of its subjects to useful citizenship. Protestantism itself has brought forth new ideals of citizenship and morality, but the Church continues to be the compulsory means of morality and culture. As such she is antiquated and therefore hated. Then, too, in Germany more than anywhere else, there has come to be a wide gap between the cultured (i. e., the "official") class and the masses of the people, and this has begotten a corresponding gap between the pastors (i. e. the "officials" of the Church) and their congregations. The clergy have scorned to associate familiarly with the membership of their Churches, and the rank and file of their members have stood aloof from the clergy like the proletariat from the aristocracy and have regarded them with anything but feelings of love.

Moreover, when one after another the classes awoke to self-realization, first the middle class and then the working classes, the official Church remained cool and unsympathetic. Her attitude has always been anti-social. At the critical periods she has failed to lay hold on the task of training men up into the highest sort of personal liberty and self-realization, that which comes from a knowledge of eternal Truth. Thus rare opportunities were completely lost and the Church came to be regarded as reactionary. And finally, in the formulation and presentation of her own system of truth the Church has not always manifested that degree of open-mindedness and that absolute independence of thought which the enlightened classes desire. She has not been so cordial in her attitude towards the progress of the sciences nor so progressive in her position on current problems as

the times seem to demand. Individual representatives of the Church have often manifested an intolerance of disposition and an officiousness of mien that has made them the objects of cordial hate. Thus the Church has seemed the representative of a by-gone age. These are the real reasons for the enmity to the official Church, and here again it will be observed that practically all of these conditions are involved in the fact of State-Churchism.

It requires but the external occasion for this deep enmity to burst forth into popular indignation. Such occasions recur from time to time, as when some popular liberal pastor is disciplined by the officials of the State-Church or when it is proposed to increase the salaries of the pastors. The periodic recurrence of these outbursts causes the unpopularity of the Church to grow by leaps and bounds and now most recently all these streams of opposition are gathered together by the Monists, Socialists, and Free Thinkers, and are concentrated in the interest of their vigorous campaign for withdrawal from the Church. A report of the expressed opinions concerning the Church and the clergy would not make pleasant reading.

The third and most important cause of the movement which we are considering is political. Germany is to-day witnessing an uprising of the masses against the classes. The fight is carried into every imaginable field, the fight for the franchise and for the recognition of the rights of the laboring man. Victory inclines more and more to the side of the masses and against the classes. Socialism is moving forward like a resistless tide. Already the Socialists have 110 representatives in the Imperial Diet, and thus they constitute the strongest party there and easily hold the balance of power in legislation. And in other law-making bodies they are slowly forcing the State to recognize their demands. Now these Socialists take advantage of every opportunity to attack the present political order and to humiliate those who are in authority. Right gladly therefore they enter into the present campaign for withdrawal from the Church for they hope thus to strike a blow at the State. They recognize the Church as the partner of the State. The Church as organized and established gets her authority and maintenance from the State, and the State in turn is supported in her authority by the

Church. The Socialists are bent upon the overthrow of them both. The underlying motive therefore is political.

True, the Socialist party as such has not entered into this organized attack upon the Church. But after the Monists had started the movement the Socialists as individuals entered heartily into the warfare. Socialists are the prominent speakers at the meetings that are held. Socialist papers support the movement. Socialists constitute the great majority of those who withdraw. And the socialistic motive is more often appealed to than any other. The Church is attacked as anti-social. She is represented as a Church of the classes, even as the State is a State of the classes. Her interests and her spirit are represented as identical with those of the hated ruling classes in the State. It is pointed out that every effort at Christian Socialism within the official Church has either been stifled at once or else has been of short duration. There is no hope for the oppressed masses except in the break-up of the established Church. Such are the motives that are appealed to. So strongly socialistic is this propaganda, both in its appeals and in its methods, that this fact has served to hinder the movement very considerably among the higher classes. Most of the individuals who have participated in these recent manifestations of hostility to the Church have acted definitely and consciously as Socialists. That is to say, they have been actuated by the motive of hostility to the present political order and they have hoped by their withdrawal from the Church to hasten the embarrassment of this bureau of State and to humiliate this class of State officials. Other motives, such as the religious and the ecclesiastical, have in many cases helped matters along, but in most cases the chief and primary motive has undoubtedly been political. The Church has been made the victim of adverse social and political conditions and this is the most important cause of the present flood of withdrawals.

This movement has been limited almost entirely to the Protestant Churches. The causes which we have mentioned to account for the movement naturally do not apply to the sects, nor to the separated Free Church or "Old Lutherans," but only to the established Church. Then, too, it has been impossible to move the Catholics to wholesale withdrawal. The reasons for this are obvious and not the least among them is the fact that the Catholic Church has its own political party in German af-

fairs. Moreover, the Jews naturally remain almost untouched by the agitation to withdraw from their religious organizations. They might change their faith but they could not change their race. Nevertheless, they do not scruple to join assiduously in the effort to wreck the evangelical churches. Here again political motives predominate and in general the confessional distribution of the movement points to political causes.

#### PROBABLE EFFECTS OF THE MOVEMENT.

In the light of this analysis of causes it is evident that the present *Austrittsbewegung* does not mean a decline of real Christianity in Germany. It does mean that in the hundreds of thousands who will withdraw from the Church this year and in the next few years, the Church is shedding a large portion of that indifferent and really hostile element of her membership which has hitherto been clogging her progress like so much rubbish. The Church as such is not to blame for the existence of such an element within her borders. It is involved in the fact of State-Churchism. And the Church will have made substantial gain when she has purged off those hundreds of thousands who are now only nominal members of the visible organization and who serve no useful purpose whatever except to pay a small Church tax. The adherence of these irreligious multitudes has been a positive hindrance to the prosperity of the Church and their withdrawal from the organization will be a positive gain. The Lutheran Church will have lost in numbers but of Lutheranism there will be as much as ever, and real Christianity will not have declined one whit.

The storm that has attended the present movement for withdrawals is deplorable but it is not dangerous. There is a much greater danger to the Church than the loss of mere numbers. That real danger is that the Church will continue to retain within her fold a vast host of those who have completely broken with her faith and who do not hold to her confession but who are nevertheless determined to dominate the Church with their views and thus throw open the doors to other enemies and then dig up the foundations from within. No, a qualitative exodus from the Church will be an unmixed benefit to her. This fact is recognized by some of the leaders in the German Church. They realize



that the withdrawal of the masses will impose upon the Church a host of serious problems, and they regret the spirit and the manner in which the withdrawals are taking place, but at the same time they realize that the general result which will be brought about, namely, the separation of the faithless from the faithful, is highly desirable and will ultimately prove a blessing.

The Church is powerless to stem the present tide of withdrawals. Nor has she made serious efforts to do so. Individual pastors have attended and addressed meetings that have been held to agitate against the Church and their efforts have met with varying success. Several demonstrations in favor of the Church have been arranged in different localities. The preaching of the clergy has become apologetic in tone, and apologetic literature has been scattered abroad. But officially neither Church nor State has taken any notice of the movement. And the hope is expressed on all sides that no such notice will be taken but that the widest discussion and the fullest freedom of expression will continue to be permitted. The only effective remedy that the Church could hope to oppose to the difficulty would be to show herself more useful to the nation and to bend herself more closely to the needs of those who remain within her fold. The Church must cease to be the Church of the State and must become more and more the Church of the people. The practical suggestions that are being put forth to secure that end are legion in number. The group of serious Christians who constitute the real Church in each congregation must cultivate their Christian faith and exercise themselves in Christian love until they prove themselves a positive influence for righteousness and social uplift in the community. Only thus can the Church prove her divine mission and win back a position in the favor of the great masses of the large cities and the millions of laborers who are for the present alienated from her.

But meanwhile a vast change will have taken place in the organization of the Church. The Church and State will have separated. This is a consummation that has long been impending. For many years the course of events, both ecclesiastical and political, has been pointing in that direction. It has been drawing closer and closer. The leaders in the Church herself have recognized that the separation must come. And most of them have recognized such a separation as desirable. But they have

generally felt that the time for such a step is not yet ripe, and that if it should come now it would be attended with disaster for the Church. Now, however, it does not seem possible to postpone the event much longer. The various factors that operate in that direction (see LUTH. QUART., Jan. 1912, pp. 144ff.) have all been gathering force constantly. And now in the light of most recent events it requires no prophetic insight to foretell that separation of Church and State or at least some readjustment of their relations must come in the near future.

The present movement of withdrawals will fall and rise and fall, but it will go generally forward and in the end will bring results. To what extent the authorities will still be able to guide and direct the process of separation remains to be seen. They will set themselves to the task now that they are compelled to. It is greatly to be regretted that this process is being forced upon the Church and the State from below, for thus it has strengthened the hands of their enemies and it threatens to make impossible, at least for some years, such a *friendly* independence between Church and State as obtains between these two institutions here in America. But there can be little doubt that we are standing to-day at the deathbed of State-Churchism in Germany and that the *Austrittsbewegung* has sounded the knell of the State-Church. And the death of the State-Church will be the dawn of a happier era for the living and immortal Church of Christ.

Gettysburg, Pa., March 27, 1914.

## ARTICLE IX.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY. NEW YORK.

*The Reformation in Germany.* By Henry C. Vedder, Professor of Church History in Crozer Theological Seminary. Cloth. Pp. xlix, 466. Price \$3.00.

This handsome and well printed volume from the press of the Macmillan's is the product of the long and painstaking labors of Professor Vedder. The arrangement of the matter is simple and orderly and the style of composition is clear and good. The main facts of the Reformation are faithfully presented, and the appendixes contain valuable matter: The Ninety Five Theses, Tetzel's Theses on Indulgences, Appeal of Brother Martin Luther to a Council, The Decree of Worms, Luther Against the Murdering and Robbing Bands of Peasants, The Protest at Speyer, and The Peace of Augsburg.

The author's chief justification for retelling the story of the Reformation is the supposed need of its "economic interpretation," which has hitherto not been attempted. The dedication of the volume "to Walter Rauschenbusch, Prophet of the New Reformation," indicates somewhat of the author's attitude. An interpretation based upon the economic features of the Reformation must necessarily be one-sided, and must fail to present it in its broad character as a magnificent religious revolution. The economic conditions of the time naturally forced themselves upon the attention of Luther, but they were always secondary and incidental. Luther was aiming to make the tree good rather than the fruit. He was fighting for the restoration of the true faith as fundamental to the new life.

Our author believes that "underlying and conditioning both the religious and political phases of the Reformation were its economic and social causes." "The monastery had to go that business might come." "The religious revolution succeeded because, and just so far as, the German princes and the councils of the free cities for motives of their own—usually selfish and sordid reasons—took the matter in hand and promoted Lutheranism." "From some points of view the Reformation appears almost a failure..... It substituted for the universal Catholic Pope a group of new Protestant popelets..... The Reformation accomplished little for religious liberty..... By his inconsistency Luther has much dimmed his own glory..... His earlier service to the world .... must be held to outweigh

his later treason to truth. ....The Reformation was not a great immediate ethical force. ....Instead of this ethical renovation Luther offered novelties in doctrine, a theological reform, not an ethical.....The Anabaptists were silenced, trampled into the mud, destroyed; and the clock of civilization was set back three hundred years."

The quotations in the preceding paragraph are taken from the chapter on "The Peace of Augsburg" (p. 386-392) and fairly represent the author's general attitude. As though alarmed by his conclusions, he inquires, "If, then, the immediate results of the movement are so disappointing, if it did almost nothing for social reorganization, for civil and religious liberty, for the enlightenment of the world and its advance in civilization, what is its significance?....The Reformation is important to us to-day not so much for what it immediately accomplished, as for what it made possible. It shattered many idols and some ideals, but the new ideals that it offered in their stead have ever since ruled the world."

The author in his strictures on the Reformation has failed to distinguish the noble edifice from the scaffold and the debris which accumulated while it was building. His complete subversion of the religious motive of the Reformation and of the evident providence of God leaves him in the dilemma of having no adequate explanation for one of the greatest movements of history.

The animus pervading Professor Vedder's work is a deep underlying dislike of Luther, whose greatness he is *constrained* to acknowledge on the one hand, and whom he never fails to disparage on the other. This is apparent in the first sentences of the Introduction: "Luther taught nothing new. His doctrine was not even new in Germany. A generation earlier John of Wesel had attacked indulgences, and had taught justification by faith in Luther's own university, with equal boldness and superior learning. Wiclif in England, Huss in Bohemia, and Cavanaugh in Italy had fully realized the corruptions of the Roman Church, and denounced them with a vigor that even Luther never excelled."

This is a very superficial view of the facts. Of course Luther taught nothing new, in the sense of original. He taught the old truths of the Bible, but he taught them in a way that was new to his generation, and he taught them differently from the so-called "reformers before the reformation." It is not true that Wesel's teaching concerning justification was correct. In common with Wessel, he taught that the forgiveness of sins is the infusion of the *gratia gratum faciens* (grace making acceptable). They still had the idea of an infused righteousness. Concerning these teachings Seeberg (Hist. of Doctrine ii, 209) properly says, "These are all medieval ideas. As long as they

are not abandoned, all the admirable attempts to overthrow the monastic ideal ..... are but a beating of the air." Wiclif (Wickliffe) held most extraordinary views on the rights of property, claiming that only the predestinated and the pious had a right to its possession. In short, the views of all these noble men were more or less defective, and lacked the balance and the completeness of Luther's ideas. He realized as no other man in his age the need of his time, and understood what remedy was demanded. To fail to see this unfits the historian for his task.

In confirmation of the statement that our author evidently dislikes Luther and tries to belittle him, the reader is referred to a few passages: "If Luther himself, as a passage in his *"Table-Talk"* tells us, did not so much as know that there was a Bible, until he found one in the Erfurt Library, he must have taken great pains to keep himself in such a state of ignorance" (p. xvi). "The common impression that Luther invented German hymnology is ..... utterly wrong" (p. xxiv). We doubt whether this is the common impression; but Luther certainly did much for Hymnology. "Luther's was not a systematic mind; at bottom he was neither philosopher nor theologian, and at no time in his life did he show himself capable of working out a systematic and complete exposition and defense of any doctrine" (p. 46). Luther referred opposition to his work "to the direct agency of the devil, in whom he believed with rather more energy than he believed in God" (p. 169). To discredit Luther's marvelous work in translating the Bible, it is said that "Any minister to-day, who has had the Greek Course of the College and Seminary is a far better scholar than Luther" (p. 170). "The only accurate description of Luther's version is to call it a careful revision of the older text" (p. 171). "Jealousy of Carlstadt actuated his entire conduct toward his older colleague" (p. 191). "We are indignant at Luther for his intolerant persecution of the man who had dared to differ from him" (p. 192). "He has drunk the new wine of popular applause, and the heady beverage has intoxicated him" (p. 193). "In a burst of rage and selfish fear he sat down to compose a pamphlet against the robbing and murdering bands of peasants in which he raved against them with frenzied violence" (p. 243). As the son of a peasant in taking "the side of the princes .... he was acting the renegade" (p. 244).

It is not our purpose to answer all these insinuations and aspersions, which might be easily done, in part even from the volume itself.

Of course, Dr. Vedder takes pleasure in condemning Luther for sanctioning the bigamy of Philip. "Luther met the crisis [of exposure] with his accustomed mixture of bravery and moral insensibility." "None of the biographers of Luther have ven-

tured to uphold his part in the transaction. .... Few have had the courage to tell all the facts" (p. 354).

It would be too much to expect of Dr. Vedder that he would read impartial opinions on this unfortunate affair. "Regrettable as is his connection with the bigamy, an impartial student can hardly doubt that he acted conscientiously, not out of desire to flatter a great prince, but in order to avoid what he believed to be a greater moral evil. His statement in the *Babylonian Captivity* that he preferred bigamy to divorce, and his advice to Henry VIII in 1531, both exculpate him in this case. Moreover the careful study of Rockwell has shown that his opinion was shared by the great majority of his contemporaries, Catholic and Protestant alike." *Life and Letters of Martin Luther*, by Preserved Smith, p. 384. A matter of special aggravation to Dr. Vedder in the life of Luther is his treatment of Carlstadt and the Peasants. Concerning the former Dr. Smith has this to say, "Not knowing where to turn, he went back to Wittenberg and besought a refuge with the Reformer. From near the first of July until late in September he was sheltered by his old colleague and opponent, who wrote a letter to the Elector, on September 12, asking him to allow Carlstadt to live peaceably at Kemberg. This petition was refused; the fanatic had to leave, and wandered long from place to place until at last he became professor in the University of Basel. He had learned his lesson, and never more was a public agitator." (p. 156).

The same authority gives the following impartial account of the situation at a critical time during the Peasant's Revolt: "For one awful moment it looked as if the insurgents would carry all before them. Luther saw the whole of Germany threatened with anarchy, and the Evangelic cause with extinction. Never found wanting in the hour of danger, he continued his journey through the disaffected districts, preaching against the rising. .... He found himself on May 4, [1525], at Seeburg in Mansfield. Not a single blow had yet been struck in the cause of order. Luther saw that the only means left to restore peace was force." Smith, p. 150. It is true that Luther urged terrible measures as the only way to stay the tide of arson and bloodshed, which threatened the land. After the defeat of the Peasants Luther pitied the poor people and wrote intercessory letters in their behalf.

Dr. Vedder says, "From that day to this, writers on the Reformation, with substantial unanimity, have seen the peasant revolt through the spectacles provided by Luther. .... They have tacitly approved Luther's ethical principle: that for a noble to kill a peasant was rendering service to God, but for a peasant to kill a noble was a crime without forgiveness in this world or in the world to come" (p. 244). This is a sample of our author's temper and historic insight. It is just this last which he

lacks. It is impossible for a man to transport himself into the ideas and scenes of the sixteenth century when he attempts to make an economic interpretation of a great religious movement in the terms of modern socialism.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. CHICAGO, ILL.

*Liberia*, Description, History, Problems. By Frederick Starr. Cloth. Pp. xii, 277. Price \$1.10 post paid.

This is a brief but comprehensive account of the black's republic in which every American ought to be interested, not simply because of the form of government, but also on account of our relation of its people who themselves or their fathers were once slaves. Important problems are suggested by Liberia in reference to the capacity of the black man for self-government, and the relation of the civilized negro to the evangelization of the dark continent.

Dr. Starr has studied the whole subject thoroughly from every side. He seems to have read all that is available, and has personally visited and investigated Liberia. His conclusions are modestly stated and are worthy of regard.

On the whole he is hopeful concerning the situation, provided Liberia be protected against European exploitation, and the American Liberians are faithful to themselves and their opportunities. Some of the prominent characters in Liberian history have been men of unselfish devotion and even of extraordinary ability; but too often they have been unable to overcome the inertia of their people and to resist the encroachments of foreigners.

It seems to us that the government of the United States is morally bound to help Liberia until it can help itself, or fails to show ability to govern itself, in which case its dismemberment would be inevitable. If our government recognizes its ethical obligation to exercise a benevolent protectorate over the Philippines, who are in all respects an alien people, it seems evident that we are bound to support and to protect a people whom we have greatly wronged. This would not involve much risk or expense to us.

From a Christian standpoint we have a great duty in helping to redeem Africa from the thralldom of superstition. Here is our opportunity to do a great work without fear of international complications.

In response to an appeal from Liberia, the United States Government sent a commission to Africa in 1909, which made a favorable report to Congress through President Taft on March 25, 1910. Six recommendations were made (1) that the United



States extend aid in the prompt settlement of boundary disputes; (2) that the United States enable Liberia to refund its indebtedness by a guarantee of the payment of its obligations to be secured by supervising the collection of customs; (3) that it lend assistance to reform international finances; (4) that it aid in forming and drilling an adequate constabulary; (5) that it maintain a research station; (6) that it reopen the question of securing a coaling station in Liberia. The second, third and fourth recommendations are being carried out.

The author speaks encouragingly in reference to the Lutheran mission, which has accomplished much good. As a member of the Board of Foreign Missions, I know of the trials of our devoted missionaries in Liberia, and have frequently discussed with them the advisability of the continuance of our mission. With one accord they plead for its continuance; and those who have suffered most are the most earnest in speaking for it. A noble widow of one of our missionaries, who laid down his life in the work, is now here on furlough, and is joyfully looking forward to the day when she can return to Africa. We have not done all that should be done, but we are learning. The chief difficulty has been the fewness of our laborers. In spite of the most strenuous efforts on the part of the Board, the mission has always been short-handed, thus burdening the few with labors too heavy to bear.

We heartily commend Dr. Starr's volume. We hope it will have a large sale.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

*Theological Symbols.* By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., D. Litt. Cloth. Pp. x, 429. Price \$2.50.

This is a volume of the International Theological Library. It was undertaken many years ago by Dr. Briggs and was practically finished when he died. His accomplished daughter and co-worker, Miss Emilie Grace Briggs, made necessary corrections as the book was going through the press.

After a thorough discussion of the "Origin, History and Definition of the Discipline in the Introduction, the subject matter is divided into three parts: I. Fundamental Symbolics, treating of the Ecumenical Creeds; II. Particular Symbolics, treating of modern denominational Creeds; and III. Comparative Symbolics, treating and comparing the doctrinal statements of the Symbols of the separated Churches, with a view to determine their consensus and dissensus, together with their underlying principles.

The Ecumenical Creeds are treated with impartial objectivity, and as far as we have noticed in the spirit of evangelical con-

servatism. We are pleased with the conclusive manner in which he upholds the doctrine of the Virgin Birth.

When the symbols of the Reformation are considered, Dr. Briggs can not conceal his prejudices against Luther, and his ignorance of Lutheran doctrinal interpretation. He declares that "Erasmus of Rotterdam was really the greatest man of the Reformation period"! (p. 158). Every historian knows that he lived and died in the Church of Rome, and that he was a coward. Luther's utter disregard of the proprieties of controversy, especially in dealing with such exalted persons [King Henry VIII and Erasmus], who were entitled by their position to reverential consideration" alienated them (p. 171). Little good could the Reformation expect from either of them, and Luther knew it. Luther disliked temporizing. "Many German authors try to make Zwingli dependent upon Luther. But Zwingli himself said, 'All deference to Martin Luther, but what we have in common with him was our conviction before we knew his name'" (p. 169). Seeberg (Hist. of Doct. ii, 307 f.) shows conclusively that Zwingli was dependent upon Luther "at the central point of all such dependence. But we can understand also the sad self-deception to which he has here fallen a victim. The study of the Scriptures was and remained for him the source of his doctrinal views; and he found Luther's ideas in the Scriptures—after he had learned them from Luther."

Concerning the Lord's Supper, Dr. Briggs says, "The Lutheran views called *Consubstantiation*, because it holds to the co-existence of two distinct and independent substances sacramentally united in the Eucharist." The term consubstantiation has always been offensive to Lutherans and repudiated by them. Dr. Briggs makes it appear that (p. 312) the Roman Catholics and Protestants are agreed as to certain phases of justification, intimating that both teach that through justification the sinner is renewed and made just. Nothing could be more misleading. In no point do the two differ more widely than in this.

The fundamental fault, especially with Part III, of this volume is that the laudable desire of the eminent author for the unity of the Church, betrayed him into the mistake of ignoring vast differences between the various bodies of Christendom. The gulf between Catholicism and Lutheranism is as wide and as deep to-day from a doctrinal standpoint as it was four centuries ago.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE GERMAN LITERARY BOARD. BURLINGTON, IOWA.

*Election and Conversion*, A Frank Discussion of Dr. Pieper's Book on "Conversion and Election," with suggestions for Lutheran Concord and Union on Another Basis. By Leander S.

Keyser, D.D., Professor in Hamma Divinity School. Cloth. Pp. 176. Price 75 cents.

We are pleased with this book—its contents and make-up. We congratulate the German Literary Board on the neat and substantial mechanical work which it always does. We would however, call attention to the omission of the title on the back of the volume, thus making it unfindable in a library. When a book is not thick enough to allow the title to appear across the back, it should by all means be stamped on lengthwise.

Though Dr. Keyser's latest book is not large, it contains much; and that much is very good. It is well thought out, is irenic in spirit, and rests upon the bed-rock of truth. In one sense it is not an interesting book, because it asserts self-evident propositions. On the other hand it is very interesting and timely, because it deals with the vital matters of salvation; and seeks to correct misapprehensions, which are cherished by a great host of Lutheran people and which are separating them from their brethren. Perhaps, it is too much to hope that this book will have a wide circulation among the Missouri Lutherans. We wish that it might. Though comparatively small the book might be condensed still more, and be published in a paper edition at a nominal price, thus assuring a larger circulation. Perhaps some wealthy broad-minded Lutheran might be persuaded to bear the expense of a free edition.

The attitude of the Missouri Synod on the subject of Election and Conversion is the matter under consideration. Recently Professor Pieper, of the St. Louis Seminary, issued a booklet on this subject, with "A Plea for United Lutheranism in America." This unity or union is to be accomplished by a universal assent to a very narrow construction of the doctrine of election. The "Plea" is made in good faith, and its grounds are apparently most reasonable—to Dr. Pieper. If we may venture to state the position of Missouri in a few words, it is (1) That God from eternity elected some to be saved, and did not elect others; (2) That those elected unto salvation are chosen by the unscrutable will of God, solely by grace and not in view of faith (*intuitu fidei*), and hence their election is shrouded in deep mystery; (3) That the unsaved are lost because they reject Christ and resist the Holy Spirit.

This exposition of election naturally lays the Missouri brethren open to the charge of Calvinism; and as a fact Calvinists frequently claim them as of like faith. But the Missourians indignantly repel the charge and "will have nothing to do with foreordination unto reprobation; she stoutly upholds the doctrine of *universalis gratia*."

In short, Missouri seems to be neither Calvinistic nor Luth-

eran, while claiming to be the latter par excellence. Dr. Keyser, however, insists with reason that it is essentially Calvinistic in denying that the divine foreordination in respect to the destiny of men is grounded in fore-knowledge.

With the greatest ardor Dr. Pieper advances abstruse and untenable arguments in defense of his belief. Concerning this attitude, as it bears on the matter of Lutheran unity, Dr. Keyser says, "To be perfectly candid, we are persuaded that there is little hope of Lutheran unity until the various Lutheran bodies are willing to grant some liberty of opinion on those great and abstruse questions about which there is, and always has been, and always will be, a difference among good and spiritually minded Lutherans." In the same line of thought he calls Dr. Pieper's chapter on the Possibility of Conversion, "a species of hair-splitting that ought to be left entirely in the domain of dogmatic liberty, and should never for a moment be permitted to cause schism in our great and beloved Lutheran Zion."

We might remind Dr. Pieper of what Dr. Luther said of predestination in his Table Talk: "I have been thoroughly tormented and plagued with such cogitations of predestination. I would needs know how God intended to deal with me, &c. But at last God be praised, I clean left them. I took hold again on God's revealed Word; higher I was not able to bring it."

Dr. Keyser points out plainly the error of Missouri concerning election. In the thought and language of the Calvinists Missouri makes a great mystery of a simple and beautiful truth. Calvin declared that he did not know why God chose some unto life and passed others by. And why did he not know, in the light of numerous passages of Scripture which declare election on the ground of faith? He knew not because of his false views concerning divine sovereignty. Starting with the conception of an Absolute Being as the fundamental truth of theology, he concluded that God was unconditioned, (which is true) and that He would not condition His dealings with men (which is not true).

Dr. Keyser clearly shows that the Bible makes much of faith, while Dr. Pieper practically ignores it. To the latter faith as exercised by man savors of merit, and hence is to be rejected as an element of conversion and salvation. He does not take into account that faith, the power to believe and to trust, is the gift of God, and not a meritorious act of man. Faith is a taking and receiving, as Luther says. To speak of merit seems preposterous, when we look upon faith as a divinely wrought power given to those who gladly hear the gospel and accept its assurances of pardon.

In discussing "The Question of Lutheran Unity," our author asks, "Is it right for the dogmaticians to divide the Church, and keep her divided, on such difficult and erudite questions? \* \* \*

We do not ask Missouri to give up her views but simply not to make their acceptance by others the terms of fellowship and union. Cannot Missouri be as generous as the rest of us?"

"To hold and accept the Unaltered Augsburg Confession as our creed, and Luther's Smaller Catechism as our book of instruction; then to acknowledge the abiding historical, doctrinal and spiritual value of the Secondary Symbols of the Book of Concord" is the platform of Lutheran unification which Dr. Keyser proposes. This is practically the doctrinal basis of the General Synod, of which we heartily approve. It is broad, generous, comprehensive. A body that subscribes this basis is safely Lutheran. Standing upon it, no one is forbidden to accept for himself everything consistent with it. Let us come to it, and extend to one another the hand of Christian fellowship.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY. PHILADELPHIA, PA.

*The Augsburg Confession*, A brief review of its History, and an Interpretation of its Doctrinal Articles, with Introductory Discussions on Confessional Questions. By J. L. Neve, D.D., Professor of Symbolics and History of Doctrines in Hamma Divinity School. Cloth. Pp. 160. Price 75 cents net.

This is a very useful little volume whose contents are indicated in the title. It will do every minister good to read it; and to the layman who wishes to get in brief compass information about the greatest of all modern confessions, it will prove a boon. The latter knows all too little about his rich heritage. We Americans, are so intensely practical that we are prone to neglect the things that are fundamental. The right view of truth in itself and in its relations is absolutely essential to an intelligent faith. In this little book there is a combination of the dogmatic and the practical, which ought to be good for head, heart and life.

The Introduction shows the importance of a proper formulation of the belief of the Church, and how impossible it is for a denomination to exist without a creed, written or unwritten. The second part is historical, reciting "the story of the Augsburg Confession." The third part gives a brief, clear and comprehensive interpretation of the twenty-one doctrinal articles.

The value of a book is not to be measured by its size. Luther's little catechism is probably the most important of all his books. Dr. Neve's book is a *multum in parvo*. It has not been hastily thrown together; but is the result of long and profound study. Out of a great mass of material, which he had gathered for a larger work, he has drawn this volume. We trust that some day the larger book will appear.

Dr. Neve is well qualified for the kind of work before us. With commendable patience and abundant learning, he unites clearness in arrangement and simplicity of diction. We heartily commend this volume to clergy and laity.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE COMMISSION ON CHRISTIAN UNION OF THE DISCIPLES OF  
CHRIST. BALTIMORE, MD.

*Christian Baptism.* By Frederick D. Kershner, Texas University, Fort Worth, Texas. Cloth. Pp. 116.

Dr. Peter Ainslie, President of the Commission on Christian Union of the Disciples of Christ, introduces the author as follows: "I am glad to stand in the gateway of this little book and say to the reader as he approaches it that he has before him a garden of unusual beauty, and the guide through this garden has so charmingly combined scholarship, truth and courtesy, that if the reader dissents from any of the views expressed, he cannot become offended, and, for all that is said, the reader will have, if not conviction, certainly both admiration and gratitude."

"This book is a most valuable contribution to a long discussed subject. It will be read with keen interest," &c., &c.

This book, so highly endorsed by a fellow immersionist, contains the stock arguments for immersion. Our Baptist brethren seem to lay practically the chief stress of baptism on the mode of administration. Concerning this we quote an apt remark of Dr. Wm. Adams Brown of Union Seminary, N. Y.: "The conception of the sacrament as an outward rite depending for its efficacy upon the correct mode of its administration has its most conspicuous illustration in the view that immersion is necessary to a valid performance of baptism. This is a relic of the legal conception of Christianity which conceives Jesus as the giver of a new law, rather than as a revealer of a new principle."

A Lutheran lays no stress on the mode. He is convinced that affusion or sprinkling is historically and Scripturally a correct mode, and that it has the sanction of nearly the entire body of Christians on earth to-day. It is a convenient, beautiful and dignified manner of applying water in accordance with our Lord's command.

Our immersionist friends have tried again and again to read a particularistic meaning into the word *baptizo* by having it translated rather than transliterated in our English versions of the Bible. But they have not succeeded. It seems to us that there has been a divine providence in the prevention of what we would regard sectarian folly.

Would it not be in accordance with the broad principles of Christianity for the immersionists to emancipate themselves from

"formalism," and open their eyes to the other and absolute hopelessness of the platform of Christian union with immersion as its chief plank?

Our author quotes Luther as favoring the immersion of infants. True he does speak of it theoretically, at least. But he says also, "This is not necessary, but it would be becoming and appropriate" (Erlangen Ed. 21:229). Luther, however, is a dangerous authority to quote by one who rejects infant baptism. An incidental remark, which Luther probably never meant to be practically applied and which never was so understood, is rather a feeble argument for immersion.

To the mind of a Lutheran, the immersionists have a fundamental misconception of baptism. To them it is only a symbol; to the Lutheran, it is a means of grace, by which the word and promise of God are individualized. Luther and all who bear his name have ever repudiated the idea that baptism is an *opus operatum*. Without faith, Luther says, baptism is of no effect.

In reference to infant baptism the author declares, "if infant baptism is really baptism, then our whole analysis of the ordinances as contained in the preceding pages falls to the ground." For once he is logical. As "infant baptism is really baptism" according to the divine word as interpreted by nearly all the greatest theologians of Christendom and accepted by millions upon millions of Christians, the analysis "falls to the ground."

Having rejected infant baptism, the author says, "The fact remains that some rite analogous to christening would seem to be a very desirable thing for Christianity!"

The author gives no evidence of any acquaintance with the real grounds of infant baptism. If he knows them, he evidently regards them as purile. His apparent rejection of the fact of original sin naturally and by implication dispenses with the necessity of a Savior from sin, until the child has become guilty of actual transgression. In other words a human being dying in infancy would need no Jesus Christ, who came to seek and to save the lost!

If the esteemed author would ponder the matter of sin, if he would meditate upon the passage "As in Adam all die," he might attain a mental attitude in which the arguments for infant baptism would be regarded as at least worthy of respect. He might then be led to see (a) that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, (b) that the Church of the Old Testament and of the New Testament are one Church, both including infants, (c) that baptism is the sign and seal of an everlasting covenant, (d) that the family in the Bible and in all oriental lands is a unit, and (e) that there has never been a day in the history of the Christian Church when infant baptism was not practiced.



EATON AND MAINS. NEW YORK.

*India, Malaysia, and the Philippines, A Practical Study in Missions.* By W. F. Oldham. Cloth. Pp. viii, 299. Price \$1.00 net.

This volume comprises a series of lectures delivered before the Syracuse University, in 1913, on the Graves Foundation. They are simple, fresh and to the point. They convey just such information as the average student of missions desires to have. About half of the volume deals with general missionary problems from a practical standpoint. The author deals most sensibly with the "Pros and Cons of Missions," "The Missionary" and "The Message." Specifically he treats of India, Malaysia and the Philippines, of course largely from the viewpoint and experience of the Methodist Church, which has certainly done a wonderful work in these lands. There is no pessimism in this book. It will act as a tonic on run-down missionary interests; and will help the minister in his missionary sermons.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE. ST. LOUIS, MO.

*Faith and Duty.* Sermons on Free Texts, with reference to the Church-Year. By the Rev. Louis Buchheimer, Pastor of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of the Redeemer, St. Louis, Mo. Pp. 321. Price \$1.25.

This volume of sermons by a Missourian pastor is, in our estimation, of more than ordinary value. No wonder that this preacher "enjoys an enviable reputation as a pulpit orator." We have been reading and reading these sermons, and have become so impressed that we have formed the resolution some time to spend a Sunday in St. Louis in order to hear him. One reads so many sermon books, but this is different from the great mass of that literature. We admire the control Rev. Buchheimer has over his text, the wealth of his applications in the most natural interpretation of his text. And then there is the beautiful form of these sermons; a rare spontaneity and felicity of expression. The diction is frequently almost poetical and yet never out of tune with the pulpit vernacular. The ministers of the Missouri Synod have developed a remarkable uniformity in thought and expression, so that it is often said: "If you have heard one then you have heard them all." Rev. Buchheimer's sermons are unique. His range of thought is large. He rides no hobbies. No far-fetched doctrinal polemics mar the sermons. But there is a clear ring of the Gospel as the only cure of sin. In structure there is a conservative departing from the modes of tra-

ditionally German homiletics. The sermons are short, covering four, five or at most six pages. The introduction is frequently much longer than a German handbook of homiletics would permit. A great moral earnestness permeates the volume. This sermon book deserves the heartiest commendation.

J. L. NEVE.

THE METHODIST BOOK CONCERN. 150 FIFTH AVE., NEW YORK.

*Our Spiritual Skies.* By Charles Coke Woods. Size 12 mo. Pp. 232. Price \$1.00 net.

This is a very suggestive and stimulating book. It is made up of some thirty or forty papers on as many different topics. Most of them are quite brief, in some cases covering only two or three pages. A few are longer, occupying as many as from fifteen to twenty pages. But whether short, or longer, they are all packed full of real, live truth, expressed in a style that fairly tingles with life and inspiration. It would be a dull soul, indeed, that could read this book without feeling the pulse quickened, faith strengthened, hope revived, and courage rising. The preacher who is looking for strong, quotable phrases, or for seed-thoughts that carry in them the germs of great truths, or the raw material for many a good and helpful sermon, will find them here in abundance.

The papers are divided into three classes: first, *The Skyward Look from Life*; second, *The Skyward Look from Literature*; third, *The Skyward Look from Scripture*. The general spirit is optimistic, hopeful, inspirational. The author would have us ever to look up, and on, and to hold fast our confidence in God and good, no matter how deep the present shadows may be, nor how trying our present experiences.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Sovereign People.* By Daniel Dorchester, Jr. 12 mo. Pp. 243. Price \$1.00 net.

"The Sovereign People" of this volume are simply, the people, the common people, all the people. It is a strong plea for the recognition and rights of Democracy, of "the people in their collective capacity."

The general standpoint from which the author writes may be gathered from a few extracts from the first chapter, which bears the same title as the book, *The Sovereign People*.

"There have been long periods when society, like the ocean on a calm day, seemed stationary, progress was confined to certain favored classes. But out of the depths of human yearnings and needs there has flowed a mighty gulf current, which has been steadily broadening and deepening, until to-day its flood of

gathering waters is sweeping along every people and changing the political and moral climate of every country. This gulf current in the ocean of humanity is democracy, though this term by no means comprehends or expresses the full significance of this current. It is religious and social as well as political, and as such is the mightiest movement in human affairs to-day, not only in the United States, but in every civilized country, on the face of the earth."

"A true democracy is not merely a form of government, but the organic manifestation of the people in their collective capacity, and thus invested with a sovereignty and a character distinctively different from the individuals maintaining it."

The author freely grants that the people may not yet be prepared to rule wisely, nor to do all things well. "Democracy at present, like every other form of government, is a 'rough second best.' The worst as well as the best passions of mankind are continually struggling for supremacy, and the divine will diffused in humanity, upon which all salutary governments depend, is only partially manifest." "The voice of the people is not always the voice of God, but a strange jargon of high-sounding pretensions and selfish clamors."

But then neither has the rule of the "superior classes" been without mistakes and injustice, and sometimes disaster. "The voice of kings or aristocracies is not always wise and just. The arrogant pretensions of the divine right to rule has been associated with every crime known to humanity." And, on the whole, "the people" have been right oftener than "the classes." "The history of democracy shows that in every great moral crisis, when the issue between right and wrong has been clearly presented and discussed, the clarified residuum in the popular verdict has been in favor of the right and chosen the men best fitted to enforce the right. The judgment of the people has been proven again and again to be wiser than the judgment of any class, and out of the conflict of popular discussion and election have come more substantial benefits to humanity than have ever been conferred by kings and nobles."

An admirable feature of the discussion all through is the clear recognition of God's presence and activity in human affairs, ruling and over-ruling, and making all things to work together for the accomplishment of his own ends and purposes. "A Power transcending all classes, parties, and even governments is continually at work in the soul of society instilling new ideas and bodying forth in multitudinous forms of economic, moral, and spiritual well-being. Human progress can never be explained apart from this supernatural factor."

All these quotations are from the first chapter. The other chapters, of which there are ten, deal with such topics as, *The Shackles of Plutocracy; The Industrial Struggle; Rent, the*

*Modern Fate; The New Socialism; Wealth and Welfare; The Church and Her Critics.*

Under this last heading, which belongs to the next to the last chapter, the author makes a straight-forward and manly defense of the Church against an unfair criticism, even while admitting that the Church has not been as active as it should have been in moral and social reform, and has by no means always done its whole duty. He says, "The Church, like democracy, falls below ideals." "The Christian Church on its march to establish the kingdom of God, is far from being a compact, well-drilled, disciplined body." He then quotes the following from the *Outlook*, with hearty approval, "Yet nothing is more certain than its slow, hesitating advance; and once advanced, it entrenches itself more strongly in its positions than any other force on earth. Moreover, it is the van of the Christian Church which helps to lead every sociological movement to-day. More than three-fourths of all social workers in America at this moment are members of Christian Churches. Take away the men and women whom the Church has set aflame with her ideals of brotherhood and self-sacrifice, and every charitable work in America would be crippled to-morrow."

No one can read this book without being interested and stimulated, even if he should not agree with the author's positions in all points. It is especially a book for the non-professional reader, not that it lacks scholarly thought and treatment of the subject, but because it is written in such a plain and transparent style that even a reader, who knows little or nothing of the technical terms of sociology, can follow the discussions understandingly and profitably.

JACOB A. CLUTZ

*The Diary of a Minister's Wife.* By Anna E. A. Droke. Illustrated by George Avison. 12 mo. (5 x 7¾ inches). Pp. 259. Price \$1.25 net.

Those who have read Mrs. Cora Harris' *The Circuit Rider's Wife*, and have enjoyed it, as all readers of it must, will find a good companion to it in this volume. As both these books tell the story of a Methodist minister's wife and her experiences, there are naturally many points of general resemblance. Yet there are also marked differences.

Charles Sherwood, the husband of the minister's wife whose experiences are recorded in this "Diary," is a man of more than average ability, of studious habits, and with a good store of common sense. Hence, in spite of a naturally weak constitution, he steadily rises in his profession, and we leave him, in middle life, as the successful pastor of a strong city church, and with a call to take the presidency of a western college, which call he has de-

cided to accept. As this will end his career as an itinerant pastor it also ends his wife's "Diary."

But he has already served quite a number and variety of churches, including a remote country "circuit" and a western "Home Mission." This gives occasion for an interesting and animated description of a varied experience, sometimes grave and sometimes gay, sometimes filled with pathos and even tragedy, and sometimes with comedy and smiles. Probably the parts that the wives of ministers themselves will most enjoy will be those which tell of the impositions upon the hospitality of the pastor's home by all kinds of thoughtless, and selfish, and inconsiderate people. Fortunately for ministers' wives this is not as common now as it was a generation ago.

The strongest, and perhaps the most valuable part of the book, is that which tells the reader how, through the pathetic life-story of a western ranch woman, the minister's wife herself was led to a new apprehension of God's abiding presence with his people, and of the peace and quiet which came through a childlike trust in his love, and wisdom, and care.

Altogether, the book is a good and wholesome one, and will be read with great pleasure and profit, not only by ministers' wives, but also by the "sisters" of the congregation, who may thereby get a new insight into the peculiar trials and difficulties of a "minister's wife," that will make them more considerate and sympathetic when she fails to meet all their expectations as to what she ought to be and to do. They will find, what sometimes seems to be forgotten, that the "minister's wife," instead of belonging to a different order of being, is a woman of like passions with themselves with a mind and a heart just like theirs, and with very much the same demands on her time, and strength, and purse that they have, plus those which are peculiar to the place and functions of a "minister's wife."

There are eight full page illustrations which really illustrate and add greatly to the interest and life-force of the story.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY. NEW YORK AND CHICAGO.

*The Renascence of Faith.* By Richard Roberts. With an Introduction by G. A. Johnston Ross. 12 mo. Pp. 318. Price \$1.50 net.

This is a book to be read not once only, but again and again, and then still again. This is not because it is difficult to understand, nor because the reader is likely to agree with all that he finds in it, but because it is packed full from beginning to end of the most stimulating thought, thought that provokes thought and

opens up to the thinker great vistas and far horizons that have likely never greeted his vision before.

It is interesting to know something of the author of such a book as this. This information is given in the introduction by Professor Ross. In brief, Mr. Roberts was born in Wales and is now something past forty years of age. While still quite a young man he was called to London where he is now pastor of Crouch Hill Presbyterian Church. Here he soon won an influential place as a clear and strong thinker and a force to be seriously reckoned with in the ecclesiastical and even the political life of the metropolis.

In this book he speaks like one of the old Hebrew prophets, rebuking and even denouncing the Church for its failure to measure up to its responsibility and opportunity. Still, he does not write as a pessimist, as the very title of the book indicates. The general spirit of the book is very well expressed in a single sentence from the author's own Preface, "Though pretending to no gift of prediction, I am not ashamed to confess that I am anticipating a revival of the spiritual way of life among us—a renaissance which may make a new man of the average man of to-day, which will deliver the Church from that mediocrity of experience and endeavor by which Christ is discredited in our time, and which will deliver national life from the undisguised materialism of its policies and adventures."

The discussion is divided into three parts under the general titles, "The Average Man," "The Wilderness," and "The Spiritual Point of View." To use the author's own characterizations, Part I "is a brief essay in diagnosis;" Part II, "the diagnosis is carried farther afield," and the hope is awakened of "the resurgence of a new order of life through the renaissance of faith." Part III "contains an attempt to appreciate the consequences which are likely to follow from such an awakening of the spiritual life, in the domains of religion, thought, and conduct."

But this only gives one a birdseye view of the rich fields of thought spread before him in the book, and that too from a far flight. If he wants to really discover and appreciate the richness of these fields he must get down close to them, and pass through them chapter by chapter, with an alert attention and an open mind, and above all with an open heart. Perhaps the chapter headings themselves will give a better clue to their contents. For example, the six chapters in Part I, on *The Average Man*, are on "The Man Himself," "The Eclipse of God," "The Eclipse of the Other Man," "The Blight of Shallowness," "The Dismemberment of Life," and "The Evil Seed." In Part II there are also six chapters on "The Voice in the Wilderness," "The Tyranny of Things," "The Blind Alley of Science," "The Insolvency of Organized Religion," "The Harvest of Bad Husbandry," and "The Signs of the Times." Part III has twelve

chapters, all with equally striking titles. We quote only six as samples, "From Flesh to Spirit," "The Historical Jesus and the Eternal Christ," "Life at the Cross," "The Fellowship of the Cross," "The Imperialism of the Spirit," and "The Spiritual Life at Work."

As Professor Ross says in his introduction, "Mr. Roberts writes with the vivacious, surging fluency of the bilingual Celt, and there are phrases on almost every page that startle by their quick whipping of sound into the service of sense." It is dangerous to begin to quote in illustration of the truth of this statement as the temptation will be to go on indefinitely. Let the following suffice, picked not like grains of wheat from a great pile of chaff, but rather like a few sample grains from a great heap of similar grains all equally perfect and nutritious, "It is not beside the point to remark that a good deal of what passes as honest doubt is deliberately dishonest unbelief which is intended to cover a vicious life or to choke off a troublesome conscience." "A man may go a long way quite respectably even upon the level of moral mediocrity so long as his social moorings hold. His love for his mother or wife or children, or some other deep sentiment, will save him. But let him lose that, and all his safeguards come tumbling down, with such results as we frequently see." "The Jewish sense of the God-without made man a worm. The Greek sense of the God-within made man a king. It was Christianity that solve the problem of how a man could feel a worm and a king at the same time—which is just what a man should feel." "The average man does not use his brains. Not indeed that his brains are unused. It is one of his tragedies that his brains are so frequently used by unscrupulous and dishonest men." "While the policy of the modern newspaper is determined by the average man, the politics of the average man is very largely determined by the newspaper." "The most subtle device of Satan for the undoing of man's soul is to tempt him to use opportunities of public service for the pursuit of private ends." "There is a good deal of the ape and the tiger left in us; and materialism can do no other than encourage their dominion over us. It has no sanctions which can evoke the spirit of fraternity or the temper of co-operation, save only in the exploitation of the weak. Its most characteristic products are the Trusts." "The proper answer to sceptical and rationalistic onslaughts is not defense but defiance; increased aggressiveness, more unremitting propagandism—it is along these lines alone that Christianity can justify itself finally to the world." "A creed must be judged by its ethic; and the ethic of materialism may be seen in the jungle." "Biblical criticism has frequently been merely a stalking horse for private theories." "Science does not impose its hypotheses upon the facts, but derives them from the facts." "It is due to the pressure of the evolution idea that we have been endeavoring to whit-



tle down the dimensions of Jesus so that He may fit into our little schemes of thought." "The theologian who struggles with words in order to compass the inwardness of Jesus is far nearer reality than the critic who proceeds by writing off whatever transcends a purely human quality in Jesus."

But why go on? One cannot exhaust a genuine gold mine, nor really test its richness, by taking out a thimbleful of ore here and there. The only way to make a satisfactory test is to get down into the mine with pick and shovel and dig.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS. NEW HAVEN, CONN.

*The Pulpit and the Pew.* By Charles H. Parkhurst, D.D., LL.D. 12 mo. (5½ x 8¼ inches). Pp. 195. Price \$1.50.

This is the most recent volume of Lectures on Preaching, on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, delivered before the Yale Divinity School in 1913. It will likely take its place among the very best of the series which began so brilliantly by the three courses given by Henry Ward Beecher in 1872, 1873, and 1874.

Dr. Parkhurst has been the pastor of Madison Square Presbyterian Church of New York City for more than thirty years, and has long been known as one of the ablest and most fearless preachers of righteousness in that great city. Some years ago he attracted a good deal of attention, not to say notoriety, by his rather spectacular efforts to improve the conditions in New York's civic and political life. From some things he says in these lectures, he seems to have learned some valuable lessons from his experiences at that time.

Dr. Parkhurst has a trenchant style, marked by a mystery of good English, and a force and compactness which drives the truth home to the mind of hearer, or reader, with convincing power. His short epigrammatic sentences often fall from his lips like the quick, rapid blows of a sledge hammer, and there is no standing before them.

In these lectures, he seems to be at his best, and no one, certainly no preacher, can read them without having his pulse quickened, and having aroused within him a new desire and purpose to give himself more fully than ever to the great work of preaching the Gospel of Jesus Christ to a lost world.

There are eight lectures in the series. All are good and of quite equal merit, but the following titles are likely to attract the most attention, "The Preacher and His Qualifications," "Pulpit Aims," "Dealing with the Fundamentals," and especially at this time, when so much stress is being laid on social service, "Ministerial Responsibility for Civic Conditions," and "Responsibility of the Church to the Life of the Town."

What Dr. Parkhurst has to say on these last two subjects will be read with special interest because of his own past history and experience. Most men who have tried to do anything towards improving civic conditions in their own town or city, or for the promotion of any great social reform, will doubtless be ready to sympathize with Dr. Parkhurst when he says this, "One fact tending to the disheartenment of ministerial leaders seeking to champion a movement looking to better conditions in society and State is that good people, so many of them, display such a lack of staying power. Depravity is always sprightly, never gets discouraged, never knows when it is beaten, never becomes worried and tired and retires from the field to recuperate." And so of this, "Evil spirits always keep step with the beat of the devil's drum. The anarchy of the saints is no match for the organization of sinners." There is more of the same kind, but there is no pessimism, no counselling of surrender, nor of a supine submission to the devil's supremacy because the task of dislodging him is a difficult, and often a discouraging one. Far from it.

The following paragraph with which the lecture on "Ministerial Responsibility for Civic Conditions" closes, will sum up the general attitude of the lecturer on this subject, "It is then by the preaching of righteousness, pure and unadulterated, that the vices of society are to be eliminated and the faults and weaknesses of civic conditions corrected; a preaching of righteousness so distinct that it cannot be misunderstood, so concrete that it cannot be misapplied; a preaching by men that are so obsessed by their passion for the ideal that civic obliquity costs them a pang, and at the same time living so close to the world, to the men that are in it and to the transactions that go on in it, that they can address themselves to those conditions with an intelligence that will command respect, and with a sort of prophetic passion that will create courage and purpose in the sound-hearted and create a quaking among the foul spirits with which in our social and civic life we are so disastrously infected."

But, while Dr. Parkhurst would hold the ministers strictly responsible for the work of preaching righteousness, and pointing the way to better things, and even leading the Church in its assault on evil, he has no notion of laying the whole burden on them, or of excusing the laity from their share of duty and responsibility. The lecture on "The Responsibility of the Church to the Life of the Town" deals with this phase of the question, and does it in a very vigorous and stimulating way. The preaching of righteousness in the pulpit will have little effect if the message stops with the pew. Jesus could never have fed the multitude if the disciples had simply eaten the bread and fish he gave them for the people, or had put them in their wallets, or baskets and carried them away. The ministers may point out the way to improved conditions with the greatest clearness and

wisdom, but this will never really improve them unless the people in the pews will follow the directions and put them into execution. A leader, however fearless, can accomplish very little without a following. Too often this following, this practical application of the message of the pulpit by the pew, is utterly wanting.

As Dr. Parkhurst puts it, "The Church, raises money and hires a minister; raises money and pays a choir; raises money and hires Sunday School teachers; raises money and pays a missionary to preach to outside sinners that have no churchly attachment. But the Church in the great body of its membership, in the totality of its life, is as far from the outside masses as it is from Madagascar. We put the meat in the cellar and the salt in the attic and then wonder why the meat does not keep fresh." Again he says, in the same vein, "Confirming and educating the faith of believers is the prime office of the clergy; but to initiate into Christian belief those who are not believers, to bring men to Christ, as contrasted with building up in Christ, is, I claim, not the function of the clergyman, but of the layman. Some suspicion of the truth of this position appears to have been the impulse leading to the inauguration of what we know as the 'Men and Religion Forward Movement.'"

There is plenty more equally good on this and on other subjects discussed and the temptation is strong to go on quoting for the benefit of those who may not see the book. But our purpose has been, rather, to give such tastes of the rich feast provided as will awaken the desire to order the whole course.

We make one more extract, from the first lecture, on "The Preacher and His Qualifications," and then we must forbear. Speaking of the necessity for a deep conviction of the truth and importance of his message to give the preacher genuine power, the lecturer says, "We must remember that all the way from the sun down to the raindrops nothing goes unless it is carried. And the same is true of personality, even though of a gigantic order. Things go when they are picked up and carried and they go tremendously only when they are fastened upon by the impact of the great energies and the tremendous velocities. It is getting on to the windward side of a great truth and letting it blow upon us; on to the windward side of a great man and letting him breathe upon us; on to the windward side of the great Christ and letting the celestial afflatus carry us upon its own silent but stately current, that converts us from a mere splendid possibility into a half divine reality, making men heroes and able to do the work of heroes, making them prophets and able to speak the word of prophets."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

